

Marx, Marxism and the Agrarian Question I: Marx and the Peasant Commune

Teodor Shanin

THE EVOLUTIONIST CONTEXT

Volume One of Marx's Capital represented both the peak of Classical Political Economy and its most radical critique. The strength of Capital lay in its systematic, comprehensive, critical, historically sophisticated and empirically substantiated presentation of the way a newly created type of economy - the contemporary capitalist economy of Great Britain - had worked in one society.

Of paramount significance is the more general use such a model offers for other societies in which capitalism has been in manifest and rapid ascent ever since. Its limitations as well as its point of strength are 'children of their time' - the times of the breakthrough and rush forward of the 'Industrial Revolution', the rise and increasing application of science and the spread of the French Revolution's political philosophies of evolution and progress. Central to it was evolutionism - the intellectual arch-model of those times, as prominent in the works of Darwin as in the philosophy of Spencer, in Comte's positivism and in the socialism of Fourier and Saint Simon.

Evolutionism is, essentially, a combined solution to the problems of heterogeneity and change. The diversity of forms, physical, biological and social is ordered and explained by the assumption of an intrinsically necessary development through pre-ordained stages which it is the task of scientific method to uncover. Diversity of stages explains the essential diversity of forms. Its strength lay in the acceptance of change as a necessary part of reality. Its main weakness was the highly optimistic teleology built into such explanations: the pre-destined progress through stages meant also the necessary ascent to a world richer in content, more sophisticated and more agreeable to humans, or even to 'absolute spirit' or god himself. The materialist epistemology of Capital, the dialectical acceptance of structural contradictions and even of retrogression within capitalism, did not jettison the essential kernel of evolutionism. 'The country that is more developed industrially' was still destined 'only [to] show, to the less developed, the image of its own future'. Indeed it was a matter of 'natural laws working themselves out with iron necessity'. (1)

Yet Marx's mind was evidently far from happy with the unilinear simplicities of the evolutionist scheme. The richness of the evidence he studied militated against it and so did his own dialectical training and preferred epistemology. There was also the question why the north-western corner of Europe should have produced the first edition of the capitalist mode of production; an admission of simple accident would be far from Marx's requirement for a science of society. Thus, already by 1853 Marx had worked out and put to use the concepts of Oriental Despotism and its synonym, Asiatic Mode of Production, as a major theoretical supplement to unilinear explanations of progress. (2)

Marx's new map of societies assumed the global co-existence of potentially progressive social formations and of essentially static 'a-historical' ones. The nature of such static societies, of Oriental Despotisms, was defined by a combination of environmental and social characteristics: extensive arid lands and hydraulic agriculture necessitating major irrigation schemes, a powerful state, and state monopoly over land and labour, multitudes of self-contained rural communities tributary to the state. As a result, to use Hegel's expression, such societies simply proceed 'to

perpetuate natural vegetative existence' (3) i.e. to show cyclical and quantitative changes while lacking an inbuilt mechanism of necessary social transformation. Marx's case-list included China, Egypt, Mesopotamia, Turkey, Persia, India, Java, parts of Central Asia and pre-Columbian America, Moorish Spain etc and also, less definitely Russia, defined as semi-Asiatic,(4) The heterogeneity of global society, the differential histories of its parts, could be easier placed and explained by a heuristically richer scheme - a combination of the evolutionary stages of the progressing societies and of the a-historical Oriental Despotism (5) - which also left space in between for intermediate categories, such as 'semi-Asiatic'. Capitalism comes as a global unifier which drags the a-historical societies of Oriental Despotism onto the road to progress i.e. into the historical arena. Once that obstacle is removed, the iron laws of evolution finally assume their global and universal pace.

The attitude of Marx to colonialism, for long an embarrassment to his adherents in the Third World, was fully consistent with those views. So was his lack of sympathy with the 1857 'Mutiny' in India and with the Taiping Rebels in not-yet-colonial China. Marx abhorred colonial oppression, as well as the hypocrisy of its many justifications and said so time and time again in no uncertain terms. He accepted it all the same as a form of progress toward world capitalism and eventually to world socialism i.e. a fundamentally positive if terrible step on the long road to the New Jerusalem of men made free.

In the last period of his work, in the years after the publication of Capital, Volume One, Marx took a further step towards a more complex and realistic conceptualisation of the global heterogeneity and dynamics of social forms as well as of the patterns of their interdependence. It concerned the nature and the future of the non-capitalist components of the world increasingly influenced by the processes documented in Volume One of Capital. Four events stand out as landmarks in the political and intellectual background to Marx's thought in this period. First, the Paris Commune of 1871 offered a dramatic political lesson and a type of revolutionary rule never known before. The very appearance of the 'dawn of the great social revolution which will forever free mankind from the class-split society' (6) had moved the confines of the possible and set a new timetable for what was necessary in the establishment of a socialist society. It also provided the final crescendo to Marx's activities in the First International which ended in 1872, and was followed by a period of reflection. Secondly, a major break-through occurred within the social sciences in the 1860s and 1870s - the discovery of pre-history which 'was to lengthen the notion of historical time by some tens of thousands of years, and to bring primitive societies within the ambit of historical study by combining the study of material remains with that of ethnography'. (7) The captivating impact of those developments on the general understanding of the fabric of human society was considerable and at its centre a new insight into 'men's ideas and ideals of community (8) - the very core of European social philosophy then and since. Third, and linked with the studies of prehistory, was the extension of knowledge of the rural non-capitalist societies enmeshed in a capitalist world, especially the works of Maine and others on India. Finally, Russia and the Russians offered to Marx a potent combination of all of the above: rich evidence concerning rural communes ('archaic' yet evidently alive in a world of capitalist triumphs) and of direct revolutionary experience all encompassed by the theory and activity of Russian revolutionary populism.

The change in Marx's outlook began to take shape at the turn of the 1870s and proceeded thereafter. It unfolded in part as an afterthought to Capital Vol. I, first published in 1867, and to the debate which followed. The connection of these developments in Marx's thought and his Russian connections has been meticulously yet dramatically documented in the accompanying study of Haruki Wada, turning a variety of odd pieces of Marx's late writings, re-writings, amendments and seeming ambivalences into a consistent whole. (9) At the turn of the decade Marx becomes increasingly aware that alongside the retrograde official Russia, which he so

often attacked as the focus of European reaction, a different Russia of revolutionary allies and radical scholars had grown up increasingly engaged with his own theoretical work. It was the Russian language into which the first translation of Capital was made, a decade before it saw the light in England. It was from Russia that news of revolutionary action came, standing out all the more against the decline in revolutionary hopes in Western Europe after the Paris Commune.

In 1870-71 Marx taught himself Russian with the aim of addressing directly debates and evidence published in that language. In a letter to Engels, his wife complained about the manner in which he applied himself to the new task - 'he has begun to study Russian as if it was a matter of life and death'. (10) Marx proceeded with similar vigour to study Russian sources. What followed was a long relative silence - Marx did not publish anything substantial before his death. Yet, the direction in which his thought was moving emerges from his correspondence, notes and re-editions. Marx added to the very short list of revolutionary theorists he respected, and publicly applauded the name of Chernyshevskii - the spokesman of Russian revolutionary populism. In the new editions of Capital (1873, 1875) he dropped invectives against the early 'gentry populist' Herzen and added a passage exalting Chernyshevskii. Russia was increasingly discussed in the notes prepared for volume 3 of Capital; particularly the issue of land ownership, both large and small. In a letter of 1877, Marx rebuked 'supra-historical theorising', i.e. an evolutionist interpretation of his own writings, as related to Russia and rejected it again, much more specifically, in 1881 in the debate about the Russian peasant commune. Marx's quip in those very times about himself 'not being a Marxist' was becoming true with a vengeance in so far as Russia was concerned.

THE RUSSIAN CONNECTION

An aside concerning Russian revolutionary populism is necessary to situate Marx's new interests and friends for Western audiences. The label 'populist' like that of 'marxist' is badly lacking in precision: the heterogeneity of both camps was considerable. In Russian speech a populist (Narodnik) could have meant anything from a revolutionary terrorist to a philanthropic squire. What makes it worse is the fact that there are today no political heirs to claim and defend the heritage of Russian populism - political losers have few loyal kinsmen, while victors monopolise press, cash and imagination. Lenin's major work, *The Development of Capitalism in Russia*, from which a generation of socialists learned its Russian terminology, used 'populism' as a label to characterise a couple of writers at the extreme right wing of the populists, the equivalent of using the term Marxism for the so-called 'legal marxists' of Russia. (11) It made Lenin's anti-populist argument of 1898 easier. It makes the obscurity of the populist creed to his readers of today the more profound.

Revolutionary populism was Russia's main indigenous revolutionary tradition. The most important theorist of that line of thought was N. Chernyshevskii and its most dramatic political expression in Marx's own time was *Narodnaya Volya* i.e. People's Will or People's Liberty organisation. (12) This organisation, at its height during the 1879-83 period, exercised considerable impact but was eventually smashed by police action, executions and exile. Already Chernyshevskii had challenged both the Slavophile belief in the uniqueness (not to say intrinsic supremacy) of Russia and/or its peasants, and the liberal's propagation of West European capitalism as Russia's bright future. This double boundary has marked and delineated the mainstream of the revolutionary populist tradition ever since. A second major marker - the Tsarist state was assumed to be the main enemy of the people of Russia, both an oppressor and an economically parasitic growth. The state, in that view, was Russia's main capitalist force, as both a defender and a creator of the exploiting classes. The social costs of capitalist

progress were rejected while social equality and the livelihood of the majority were treated as the only measuring-stick of true social advance. (13)

As against the force of order, oppression and exploitation, the revolutionary populist put trust in a class war of the Russian labouring class seen by Chernyshevskii as 'peasants, part-time workers (podenshchiki) and wage-workers' - all as one (this trinity became peasants, workers and working intelligentsia in later populist writings). The idea of uneven development and the mutual impact of different societies, first expressed by P. Chadayev, came to provide the theoretical core of that analysis. Uneven development was seen as turning Russia into a proletarian among nations, facing at a disadvantage the bourgeois nations of the West. Internally, it polarised Russia. On the other hand, it also enabled and indeed necessitated revolutionary leaps in which relative backwardness could turn into revolutionary advantage. That made a socialist revolution in Russia possible. The immediate task was increasingly seen as the overthrow of Tsardom by revolutionary means, the establishment of a new regime in which an interventionist government, serving the democratically expressed needs of the people of Russia, would act in tandem with the active organisation of the local popular power.

The revolution envisaged was primarily a 'social' one i.e. one which would transform the class nature of Russia and not 'simply political' - aiming at the liberal demand for electoral rights. An uprising of the peasant majority of the nation was to play a major role, but other sub-groups of the labouring class and the revolutionaries of non-labouring class origin were to participate fully. Revolutionary populists subsequently turned the brunt of their propaganda towards the peasants. They were active also in organising urban workers and published an illegal newspaper specifically designed for them, but they did not accept an exclusive role for the proletariat. The organisation had also operated in the army, incorporating a number of officers, and was increasingly influential with students and young intellectuals. Besides propaganda, individual terror against the Tsar and the top officials was adopted as a tactical weapon aiming to shake Tsardom and to trigger off popular opposition and insurrection. As the attempts of the 1870s to propagate new revolutionary spirit among peasants proved disappointing, the significance of the 'political' goals came to be stressed, while in terms of action the centre of gravity shifted from the propaganda effort to individual terror. The majority in the main populist organisation, Land and Liberty (*Zemtva i Volnya*) established in 1876, had increasingly adopted a strategy of immediate and direct anti-state challenge aiming at insurrection (*perevorot*). By 1879 the organisation split into the People's Will (*Narodnaya Volnya*) majority and into the Black Repartition (*Chernyi Perede*) - a minority which opposed the militants, the new 'political' line and the stress on terrorist action.

A strong moralist and subjectivist streak was prominent within the populist *weltanschauung*, including the writings of Chernyshevskii - a philosophical materialist and an admirer of Feuerbach. The impact of ideas was assumed and accentuated - to the populists, a major determinant of the uneven development of societies and the ability of some of them to 'leap' over the stage of capitalism. The particular significance of intellectual elites as the leaders and the catalysts of political action in a Russian type of society was stressed - a partial explanation of the way revolutionary populists built their organisation and chose their targets in terrorist action. For those reasons and also to provide the necessary cadres for this clandestine propaganda and for terrorist action, particular stress was laid within the group upon personality training, to inculcate modesty, integrity and totality of devotion. It made the People's Will organisation famous through Europe for its discipline as much as for the asceticism and the courage of its members. (14) The Russian image and self-image of 'professional revolutionaries' and 'party cadres' have their main origin there. More, of course, is at stake in so far as the impact of Russian revolutionary populism on the future Russian revolution is concerned. For the movement, and the analysis it championed, continued to play a considerable role in the

revolutions of 1905-07 and 1917-20 and in what in the first decade of the twentieth century came to be called 'Bolshevism'. (15)

The attitude of the revolutionary populists to the Russian peasant commune was integral to their world-view. About 3/5 of the arable land of European Russia was in the hands of the peasant and Cossack communes. (16) Within them, each household held unconditionally only a small plot of land, i.e. house and garden plus its livestock and equipment. The use of arable land was assigned to a family on a long-term basis by its commune, the meadows were re-assigned annually and often worked collectively, the pastures and forest were in common use. The diversity of wealth within the commune was expressed mainly in differential ownership of livestock, non-agricultural property, and some private land, bought from non-communal sources. The use of wage-labour inside the commune was limited. Many vital services were run collectively by the commune: a village shepherd, the local guards, the welfare of the orphans, and often a school, a church, a mill etc. An assembly of heads of the households controlled and represented communal interests: decided about the services, elected its own officers, collected its informal taxes or dues. With the exception of some areas in the West (mostly ex-Polish) the assembly also redivided the arable lands once in a while in accordance with some egalitarian principle, usually in relation to the changing size of the families involved. A number of peasant communes formed a '*volost'*, its' officers local but authorised and controlled by state authorities. (17) Despite its surveillance by the state, the commune played also the role of a *de facto* political organisation, as the peasant collective's shield and weapon against a hostile external world of squire, policeman, tax officer, robber, intruder or against other villages at the commune boundary.

To the revolutionary populist the peasant commune was the proof of the collectivist tradition of the majority of Russian people, which had stayed alive in spite of its suppression by the state. It was seen also as a tool for the mobilisation of the peasants for the anti-Tsarist struggle. It was to be a basic form of the future organisation of local power which would eventually rule Russia together with a democratically elected national government. For Chernyshevskii, it was also an effective framework for part-collective agriculture in post-revolutionary Russia, which would operate alongside publicly owned industry and the minority of private (and temporary?) enterprises. The image bears remarkable similarity to some of the realities, images and plans in Russia in the NEP (New Economic Policy) period of 1921-27.

The most significant challenge to the revolutionary populism of the 1870s/1880s (and its substitute on the political map of Russia of the 1890s) was neither the Slavophiles and Liberals to their 'right' nor the few Bakuninist admirers of mass spontaneity to their 'left', but people who originated in the 'moderate' wing of their own conceptual fold. The main reason for the decline of revolutionary populism by the late 1880s was the defeat of their revolution. As the hope for a peasant uprising receded, and the gallows, death in action and exile to Siberia silenced most People's Will activists, their critics came to sound louder. A major argument against revolutionary populism came from an influential group which gathered around Mikhailovskii and his journal *Russkoe Bogatsvo*. They called for a moderate and evolutionary populism, with education as the major road forward - the 'legal populism'. They were finding an audience and a carrier in the type of the well-meaning, highly talkative but rather ineffectual rural or provincial intellectual - often an employee of the educational and welfare service of the local authorities and the co-operative movement. It was this group who came increasingly to dominate populism in 1890s (and once again in 1907-17 after the defeat of the Revolution in 1905-07) diluting its content, turning its revolutionary wing into a permanent 'wild' minority, and determining its eventual destruction. It was mostly they who 'spoke on behalf of populism' between 1883 and the end of the century.

A second line of attack on, and replacement of, revolutionary populism came from the members of the Black Repartition group who parted company with People's Will in 1879 over its insurrectionist action. The leaders of that group: Plekhanov, Axelrod, Deich and Zasulich emigrated to Switzerland and, after failing to make any headway with their own brand of populism, reorganised by 1883 into a new group which declared for Marxism, scientific socialism, the necessity of a capitalist stage and a proletarian revolution on the road to socialism. They explained the failures of People's Will accordingly. (18) The new name adopted by the group was Emancipation of Labour (*dosvobozhdenie truda*). Their eyes were now on Germany, its economy as well as the rapid increase of the German Social Democratic Workers' Party, with an explicit expectation that Russia would follow a similar route.

Their conceptual 'Europeanisation' and increasing conversion to 'westernism', the type of strict evolutionism we would call today Modernisation Theory, meant that the Russian peasant commune, and increasingly by the 1890s the peasantry *in toto*, were to them no longer an asset but a sign of backwardness and stagnation, a reactionary mass. All that had to be first removed to clear the way for the proletariat and its revolutionary struggle, and the sooner the better. They were consequently to watch with eager anticipation the development of capitalism in Russia - once more - the sooner the better, for the advance of socialism. It was to that vision that Marx referred derisively in 1881 as 'Russian capitalism lovers'. (19) His own views were moving in an opposite direction.

ARCHAIC COMMUNE AND FORERUNNER THEORY

The discovery of the peasant commune by the Russian intelligentsia led to a sharp debate about its nature and historiography. To its detractors, the peasant commune was a creation of the tsarist state, to police and tax the countryside, a device which conserved the backward ('archaic') characteristics of Russian agriculture and its political economy *in toto*. (20) To the populists and their academic allies, it was a survival of the social organisation of primitive communism, of the pre-class society, a remnant to be sure but a positive one, both in its present function and future potential. Behind the furious debate about the historiography of the commune stood fundamental political issues of strategy, of the class nature of the revolutionary camp, its enemies and even of the nature of the future (post-revolutionary?) regime. To Marx the issue of the peasant commune, significant as it was for Russia, was also a point of entry into a variety of issues of much broader significance, theoretically and politically: the place of the peasantry within a capitalist world, and the type of sub-worlds and sub-economies such 'irregularity' is bound to produce. It was also that of the socialist revolution, of the 'peasant chorus without which its solo song becomes a swan song in all peasant countries'. (21)

All that should help to place the full significance of Marx's discussion of the Russian Commune. Neither Marx nor the revolutionary populists considered the peasant commune exceptional to Russia. It was to them simply the best preserved in Europe - and one which had persisted for sound 'materialistic' reasons into a new international and local context of advancing capitalism.

Already in the *Grundrisse* (1857), Marx had undertaken extensive comparative studies of peasant agriculture and of communal land-ownership central to the major pre-capitalist modes of production. In the 1870s the works of Maurer and Morgan strengthened his conviction as to the supremacy of the primary-tribal communities in their ethnocentrism (i.e. their concentration on human needs rather than on production for profits) and their inherent democracy, as against capitalist alienation and hierarchies of privileges. The man of capitalism - the most progressive mode of production in evidence - was not the ultimate man of human history up to date. The Iroquois 'red skin hunter' was, in some ways, more essentially human and liberated than a clerk in the City and in that sense closer to the man of the socialist future. Marx had no doubts about

the limitations of the 'archaic' commune: its material 'poverty', its parochiality and its weakness against external exploitative forces. Its decay under capitalism was necessary. Yet, that was clearly not the whole story. The experience and excitement of the Paris Commune - to Marx the first direct experiment in a new plebeian democracy and revolutionary polity - was by now part of the picture. With the first experiment in post-capitalist rule entering historical evidence, Marx was more ready than before to consider the actual nature of social and political organisation in the world he strived for. To those steeped in Hegelian dialectics, children resembled their grandparents more than their parents. The 'primary' commune, dialectically restored on a new and higher level of material wealth and global interaction, entered Marx's images of the future communist society, one in which once more the 'individuals behave not as labourers but as owners - as members of a community which also labour'.(22)

Turning back from the past/future to the present, the consideration of the co-existence and mutual dependence of capitalist and non-capitalist (pre-capitalist?) social forms made Marx accept and increasingly analyse 'uneven development' in all its complexity. New stress was also placed upon the issue of the state in Russia and on the regressive aspects of capitalism. The acceptance of unilinear 'progress', be what may, is emphatically rejected. The extension of an essentially evolutionist model through the ideas of Oriental Despotism was by now insufficient. Specifically, Marx came to see the decline of the commune in Western Europe and its crisis in Russia, not as a law of social science, reflected in a spontaneous economic process, but as the result of an assault by the state on the majority of the people, a situation which was not just to be debated, but fought.

In 1881 Marx spent three weeks contemplating, one can say struggling with, an answer to a letter concerning the Russian peasant commune. It came from Vera Zasulich, an ex-terrorist, currently of Black Repartition group and the future co-editor of the marxist *Iskra*. The four drafts of the reply Marx wrote testify to the immensity of work and thought which underlaid it. It is a veritable display of 'the kitchen' of Marx's thought at a frontier of knowledge at which he, once more, found himself forerunner of his own generation and friends. It will be best to present the essence of the message in Marx's own words.

To begin with 'what endangers the life of the Russian commune is neither historical inevitability nor theory but the suppression of the commune by the State and its exploitation by capitalists, fed and grown by the State, once more at the expense of the peasants' (p.281). (23) The international context of the type of society in question was singled out, i.e. its 'specific historical environment: being contemporary to more advanced cultures and linked into global markets dominated by capitalist production' while the country 'is not, like East India a victim of foreign conquest' (pp.271, 280). The class-coalition of peasant-destroyers - the power-block in society of peasant numerical predominance - was defined as (italics added) 'the state ... the *merchants* ... the *money lenders*' - *kulaks* in its original sense - 'in that order' (p.282). The whole social system was referred to as a specific 'type of capitalism generated by the state on the account of the peasants' (p.280).

To Marx in these drafts of the letter to Zasulich, the fact that the Russian commune was relatively advanced in type (i.e. based not on kinship but on locality) and of dual nature (represented by 'individual' as well as communal land ownership) offered the possibility of two different roads of development. The specific Russian variety of state-bred capitalism was weakening the commune, but there was no 'fatal necessity' for its disappearance. The corporate aspect of the commune's existence could prevail if revolution removed these pressures and advanced technology were put to use under the communal control of the producers. Such a solution would indeed be best for Russia's socialist future. The main limitation of the rural communes, their isolation, could be overcome by revolutionary insurrection and the consequent supplementing of the state-run *volost* by elected assemblies of peasants (pp.273, 277). 'The

'corporate habits' of the Russian peasants would then make the 'transfer from the economy of individual parcels to a collective economy much easier' provided Russian society which had so long lived at the expense of the rural communes made the initial resources available for these changes.

Marx's conclusion in the 1881 draft was that a timely revolutionary victory could turn the Russian commune into a major 'vehicle of social regeneration', an 'immediate point of departure for the socialist economic mode' and a basis for 'large-scale co-operative labour' and for the use of 'modern machinery' (p.276). 'The issue is not that of a problem to be solved but simply of an enemy who had to be crushed ... to save the Russian commune one needs a Russian revolution' (p.279) - note the expression Russian revolution, twice repeated within the text. Finally, to understand it all 'one must climb down from the heights of pure theory to the level of considering Russian reality' (p.270) and 'to stop fearing the word "archaic", for the new system to which the modern society is moving will be a revival in a superior form of an archaic social type' (p.278).

The issue of the Russian peasant commune was used by Marx also as a vehicle for considering a number of fundamental problems, new to his generation, but nowadays easily recognisable as those of 'developing societies' - be it 'modernisation', 'dependency' or the related yet uneven spread of global capitalism and its specifically peripheral expression. There were several such components of Marx's new understanding, none of them worked out in full. At the centre lies the newly perceived notion of 'uneven development' - interpreted not quantitatively (i.e. that 'some societies move faster than others') but within the context of global interdependence and the mutual impact of social transformations. Marx had indeed, as documented and argued by Wada, begun to 'perceive the structure unique to backward capitalism' (23) - to say 'structures' would be probably to say it better. The idea of 'dependent development' as we see it today is not there, but its foundation is laid. Marx had come to assume for the future a multiplicity of paths of social transformation, within a global framework of mutual and differential impact. (Already in the *Grundrisse* he had manifestly accepted it for the pre-capitalist past.) That is indeed why the generalised application of the discussion of 'primitive accumulation' in *Capital* Vol. I is so explicitly rejected. There is a strong case for assuming that Marx accepted not only the capacity of the Russian peasant commune to serve as a 'point of strength for the social regeneration of Russia' (p.286) but also, up to a point, 'the ability of peasants to change themselves spontaneously'. (24) To sum it up bluntly, to Marx the England he knew, 'that is more developed industrially', did not and indeed could not any longer 'show to the less developed' Russia the 'image of its own future'. By one of history's ironies, a century later we are trying to shed the opposite claim of post-1917 Russia's monopoly over the revolutionary imagination - the assumption that it is Russia which is to show to all of the Englands of our time the image of their socialist future.

Marx's new turn of mind was unmistakably recognised and acknowledged after their fashion by doctrinaire Marxists. The manner in which Marx's communications were handled by Russian social democrats is documented by Wada. Much psychological rubbish was written in Russia and in the West about how and why those writings were forgotten by Plekhanov, Zasulich, Axelrod etc. and about the 'need for specialised psychologists to have it explained'. (25) It was probably simpler and cruder. Already in Marx's own generation there were marxists who knew better than Marx what marxism was and were prepared to censor him for his own sake.

Even Ryazanov, the most erudite of Russian marxists and first official publisher of the Zasulich drafts, as Director of the Marx-Engels Institute in Moscow, considered that they indicated the decline of Marx's capacities. On top of that gentle hint he added, quoting Edward Bernstein, an additional explanation for Marx's populist deviation. 'Marx and Engels have restricted the expressions of their scepticism not to discourage too much the Russian revolutionaries'. (26)

Poor old Marx was going senile at sixty-three or else engaging in little lies of civility and expediency, once he departed from the 'straight and narrow' of the marxism of his epigones. (An amusing affinity - during and after the 1905-7 revolution Lenin was accused of leaning toward populism by some of his marxist associates and adversaries. (27) It seems that those two have at least a deviation in common.)

RADICAL BACKWARDNESS AND CONSERVATIVE REVOLUTIONARIES

Three more related issues should be singled out for attention: the nature of the Russian experience, Marx's attitude to revolutionary movements and the place of Engels as Marx's most significant interpreter. First, while the experience of India or China was to Europeans of Marx's generation remote, abstract and often misconceived, (28) Russia was closer not only geographically but in the basic sense of human contact, possible knowledge of language and the availability of evidence and analysis, self-generated by its inhabitants. But it was not simply a question of the extent of information available, however; Russia at that time was marked by political independence and growing international weakness, placed on the peripheries of capitalist development, massively peasant but yet with a rapidly expanding industry (owned mainly by foreigners and the Crown) and a highly interventionist state. In the conceptual language of our own generation Russia was, or was rapidly turning into, a 'Developing Society' - a new type of social phenomenon. Newcomers are hard to recognise but Marx's conceptual feel was too good to miss entirely this first silhouette of a new shape. It had been also no accident that it was from Russia and from the Russians that Marx learned things about global 'unevenness' about peasants and about revolution, things which would be valid in the century still to come.

To proceed with that line of argument somewhat further, and test it, Marx's other major departure from a consistently evolutionist view was also related to a direct experience of struggle at the close 'peripheries' of capitalism in a literal sense. The Irish Fenian Rebellion made Marx write to Engels in 1868 'I used to think that Ireland's separation from England would be impossible. Now I consider it to be inevitable.' (29) As a leader of the International he had taken a public stand in accordance with this new position. In 1867 Marx defined Irish independence and the setting up of protective tariffs against England, together with agrarian revolution, as the country's major needs. Not only the conclusion, but the way he argued his case, was an important step away from the nineteenth century ideas of progress, toward the understanding of what our own generation would call 'dependent development' and its pitfalls. In the same year Marx spoke of the way the Irish industry was being suppressed and its agriculture retarded by the British state and economy. By 1870 Marx went so far as to say that: 'The decisive blow against the ruling classes in England (and this blow is decisive for the working man's movement all over the world) is to be struck not in England but only in Ireland'. (30) With full awareness of what such a stand might mean to the very centre of metropolitan nationalism, he called British workers to support the Irish independence struggle. The beautiful phrase coined in the days of their revolutionary youth by Engels, that 'people who oppress other people cannot themselves be free', (31) came back, this time with a distinctly 'third-worldish' sound.

Second, Marx asserted his political preferences loud and clear. His sympathy was with fighters and revolutionaries, be the 'small print' of their creed as it may, and against doctrinaire marxists, especially when on theoretical grounds they rebuked revolutionary struggle. That was clear when he wrote of the Paris communards 'storming heaven' in 1871. Now the members of People's Will on trial for life were to him not only right in their political stand but '... simple, objective, heroic.' Theirs was not tyrannicide as "theory" and "panacea" but a lesson to Europe in a "specifically" Russian historically inevitable mode of action, against which any moralising at

a safe distance was offensive. In contrast he had sharply turned against the Black Repartition group in Geneva. (32) It has been the way of many sophisticates of marxology to scoff at such utterances of Marx or to interpret them patronisingly as 'determined rather by ... emotional motives (33) (an antonym, no doubt, of 'analytical', 'scientific', or 'sound'). To understand political action as an exercise in analytical logic is to miscomprehend it utterly, and the Marx of the 1870s, with 30 years experience of political action, knew it well. Also, he shared with the Russian revolutionaries a belief in the necessary and purifying power of revolutionary action in transforming the very nature of those involved in it - the 'educating of the educators'. (34) That is why, moral emotions apart (and they were there and openly expressed), revolutionary ethics was often as central as historiography to Marx's political judgement. So was Marx's distaste for those to whom the punch-line of the Marxist analysis was the adoration or elaboration of irresistible laws of history, used as a license to do nothing.

Finally, and especially after Marx's death, the difference of emphasis between Marx and Engels came to anticipate a dualism which was to open up with increasing virulence in the post-Engels marxist movement. Hobsbawm's caution against the 'modern tendency of contrasting Marx and Engels, generally to the latter's disadvantage' must be here kept in mind, but also its qualification - 'the two men were not Siamese twins'. (35) The two were partners, allies and friends, while Engels's devotion to Marx and his heritage has justly become famous. On a number of issues it was Engels who led and, indeed, often taught Marx, especially in so far as political and military issues were concerned. All that is not at issue, however. In his views Engels was less inclined to move in the new directions Marx explored in the last decade of his life. Despite Engels's warnings against treating Marxism as economic determinism, he had been much more than Marx a man of his own generation with its evolutionist and 'positivist' beliefs. The same is even more true of Kautsky as the later chief interpreter of Marx and of the main Russian interpretation of Marx by Plekhanov.

While still working shoulder to shoulder, Marx and Engels had felt alike about the past; the medieval peasant commune in its Germanic version was to both of them 'the only kernel of popular liberty and life' (36) in that period. They agreed about the corrosive influences of capitalism on the peasant commune and that only revolution could save it in Russia. They both assumed that it was worth saving - to be integrated and transformed into the new socialist era. But to Engels, the future of the Russian commune was inevitably subject to proletarian revolution in the West, itself part of the irresistible march of 'progress'. The basic order of things could not be changed. But Marx was moving away from such views (how far he did move by 1882 will be forever a matter of debate). Also, while Engels bowed to Marx's superior knowledge of the 'East' and its peculiarities, the very heterogeneity of structure and motion round the globe were to Engels less of a problem, less of a bother and less of a trigger to new analysis.

The best way to test the difference between the two men is to consider Engels' writing after Marx's death. In mid-1884, in the space of two months, he wrote his immensely influential *The Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State* - 'in fulfilment of a bequest' from Marx, and using his notes. The book was brilliant in discussion of the 'archaic' social structures, yet in its other parts offered a virtual compendium of evolutionism with a dialectical 'happy end' to conclude. In it and engendered by the ever deepening 'division of labour' are the historical stages, following each other with the precision, repetition and inevitability of clockwork for 'what is true for nature holds good also for society.' (37) It all proceeds unilinearly from the 'infancy of the human race' to 'the highest form of the state, the democratic republic in which alone the decisive struggle between proletariat and bourgeoisie is to be fought'.

Then socialism - the 'revival in a higher form of the liberty and fraternity of the ancient gentes'. (38) From mid-1884 not even Oriental Despotism was seen as necessary to get the

historiography right; the very term disappeared from Engels's published work. In *Anti-Duhring* (1877) - still written in Marx's powerful presence - Oriental Despotism spreads 'from India to Russia'. (39) It is never mentioned in the *Origins*. In Engels's known correspondence the concept appears last in February 1884. From then until Engels's death in 1895, through the whole bulk of nearly 3,000 pages of his writings and letters, it was not mentioned even once. (40) We are all the way back to the *German Ideology* (1846). It had been in its time a dramatic breakthrough of major illumination - a conceptual basis for the *Communist Manifesto* (1848) with its immense and lasting impact. It was now a retrograde step.

Engels wrote well, his style served by his capacity to present complex issues with simplicity, strength and impeccable consistency of argument. There was a price to that clarity, however, and Engels's argument with Tkachev is a case in point.

Tkachev was a Russian Jacobin, a historical materialist whose class analysis made him suspect the idealisation of 'masses' by many of his comrades - he called for a direct use of force by a determined revolutionary minority. In his verbal assault on the Russian state Tkachev had overstated, to be sure, the extra-class, inertia-bound, autonomous dimensions of Tsardom - to him it was a 'state suspended in the air, so to speak, one that has nothing in common with the existing social order and that has its roots in the past ...' (41)

Yet as Engels was fond of saying 'the proof of the pudding of political theorising is in the eating'. In terms of prediction and strategy, Tkachev had concluded, in line with Chernyshevskii, that Russia might benefit from the 'relative advantages of backwardness' and thereby more easily produce 'social revolution' than Western Europe. Also in his view, that potential could be lost if not taken up in time. He had suggested - impudently, for 1874 - that there was a chance that Russia might proceed along a revolutionary path towards socialism even earlier than USA or GB. Such a 'leap' through a 'stage' would entail the conquest and massive use of centralised state power. Tkachev had also assumed that to carry out the aims of social reconstruction, while facing enemies and a still untrustworthy majority of the population, the revolutionaries should or would proceed for a time to rule 'from above' - a dictatorship by a revolutionary party. All the European Left was subsequently provided with light relief when in 1875 Engels came to exercise his wit on Tkachev. Such 'green schoolboy's views' by which Russia might do more for socialism than facilitate the beginning of the socialist revolution where it should actually begin in the West, or even more outrageously, a vision of a socialist regime in muzhik-full Russia, before the revolution in the West, was 'pure hot-air' and only proved that it was Tkachev who was 'suspended in mid-air' and still had 'to learn the ABC of Socialism'. (42) All very funny indeed, when looked at retrospectively, two generations after, in November 1917 in Russia, and a further generation after that, in October 1949 in China.

In so far as the issue of the Russian commune was concerned, Engels loyally defended to the end both the view that it may serve as a unit of socialist transformation and the proviso that for that to happen a proletarian revolution in the West must show 'the retarded countries ... by example "how it is done"' (43) - 'it' being the establishment of a post-capitalist society. He added in 1894 that 'the far-gone dissolution of Russian communal property has [since 1875, T.S.] considerably advanced.' (44) Plekhanov was by now the head of the Russian marxist organisation and Engels's main guide to Russia. (45) The Russian peasant commune was consequently considered by Engels to be on its last legs, and capitalism to be an overwhelming presence. The only thing left was 'to console ourselves with the idea that all this in the end must serve the cause of human progress'. (46) As to the European peasantry, he had even more poignant things to say, in 1894, laying bare the general attitude prevailing in the Second International: 'in brief our small peasant, like every other survival of the past modes of production, is hopelessly doomed ... in view of the prejudices arriving out of their entire economic position, the upbringing and isolation ... we can win the mass of small peasants only if

'we make them a promise which we ourselves know we cannot keep' - which was, of course, out of the question. (47)

But Engels was also a revolutionary and so were many of his and Marx's intellectual heirs. It was their support of revolutionary strategies which was increasingly at odds with the theoretical doctrine. While on the level of theory, by 1900 Marx was being 'engelsised' and Engels, still further, 'kautskyised' and 'plekhanovised' into an evolutionist mould, revolutions were spreading at the same time through backward/developing societies: Russia 1905 and 1917, Turkey 1906, Iran 1909, Mexico 1910, China 1910 and 1927. Peasant insurrection was central to most of them. None of them were 'bourgeois revolutions' in the West-European sense and some of them proved eventually socialist in leadership and results. At the same time, no socialist revolution came in the West nor did a socialist 'world revolution' materialise. In the political life of the socialist movements of the 20th century there was an urgent need to revise strategies or go under. Lenin and Mao chose the first. It meant speaking with 'double-tongues' - one of strategy and tactics, the other of doctrine and conceptual substitutes, of which the 'proletarian revolutions' in China or Vietnam, executed by peasants and 'cadres', with no industrial workers involved, are but particularly dramatic examples. In Russia, 1917-21, it had meant doing a Tkachev while talking Engels in self-explanation.

The alternative was theoretical purity and political disaster. Once again to use personal names to bring home a broader issue, the final days of Kautsky and Plekhanov, the world's most erudite marxist and the 'father of Russian marxism' respectively, are a tragic testimony and sign of this. The first died in 1938, an exile watching uncomprehendingly and aghast the double shadow over Europe of Nazism in industrially progressive and electorally socialist Germany, and of Stalinism in the first-born socialist Russia. The second died in 1918, an 'internal exile' in the midst of revolutionary Petersburg - an embittered, bewildered and lonely foe of the experiment he fathered. The terrible phrase about finding yourself 'on the rubbish heap of history' had claimed the first generation of marxist theorists.

READING MARX: GODS AND CRAFTSMEN

The very fact of transformation in Marx's thought, not just its logical unfolding, shocks those to whom Marx is God. Human vision reflects physical, social and intellectual environments. Human vision changes in time - we learn and discover. Humans misperceive, misunderstand and mispredict. In contrast, God's vision is unlimited, unchanging and infallible - it can only unfold what is already in it. It is also amoral, for there is no way to judge God's ethics - it is his word which is the moral code. That is one reason why human minds design gods as humanity's anti-model and ever crave for their existence, as the final resort in a painfully unstable world of endless heterogeneity and surprise. Not much was changed on that score in the scientific revolution of our times.

To put a case for Marx's humanity it is probably best to begin with the interpretations of his godliness. The deification of Marx of Capital Vol. 1 was deeply rooted in all the components of the Second International. The 1917 political victory made Bolshevism into the most influential interpretation of Marxism in the world. By the 1930s Stalinism had simplified it and brutalised it into a sole tool of ideological control. Stalin was right and therefore Lenin was right and thereby Marx was mostly right (or else ...). Political expediency, as defined by infallible leadership, had merged with final truth supported by indisputable ethics. Once the 'antagonistic social classes' were abolished and the communist party put in charge, the very fact of economic advance would inevitably produce socialism followed by communism. This fundamental model of state legitimisation produced powerful ideological demands for unilinearity as the sole mode of explanation - a model of inevitable progress defined by every step of the most progressive

regime on earth. Oriental Despotism (or indeed any multi-linear model) did not fit well those needs. Worse still it could be used to castigate the Soviet regime itself as retrograde. Two ways to iron out these problems were toyed with: (a) to define Oriental Despotism as a universal stage of unilinear development, after 'primitive communism' and before slavery, or else to classify it as a sub-stage of the pre-class 'archaic' societies; (b) to omit Oriental Despotism altogether as unsound on scholarly grounds. (48) Stalin resolved any such doubts by cutting through them. The concept of Oriental Despotism was abolished by decree, i.e. declared unmarxist with the usual penalties attached.

The Stalinist theoretical edifice and its historiography were challenged in the 1950/60s: at the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party as well as in Prague, by the Vietnamese peasants and cadres out facing US technology, and by the Parisian students of 1968. In theory, the early Marx's writings were the great find of those days. (46) The concept of 'alienation' has legitimised and focussed the new concern with individuals facing systems of social control, non-socialist as well as socialist. Amazingly, this very evidence of heterogeneity throughout Marx's writings gave yet another twist to his deification. Althusser introduced the idea of an 'epistemological rupture' between the early 'moralising' Marx and the mature 'scientific' Marx of *Capital*. (50) Marx was infallible after all, it simply began later. Marxism was deduction from 'mature Marx', and as of old, absolutely true. The only consequent explanations of prediction failures were necessarily, capitulation to 'bourgeois science' or high treason.

In the Soviet Union attempts to hold on to unilinear Marx have continued. A sophisticated example is the recent study of Nikoforov, who argued against his colleagues' attempts to de-emphasise Marx's involvement with 'oriental despotism' and 'Asiatic Mode' but concluded that Marx returned to unilinearism in 1881, under the impact of Morgan. (51) Once again, Nikoforov hammers home his conclusions not through what Marx actually said, but mainly by using Engels's writings, especially *The Origins* etc. Marx's writing about 'the more or less centralised despotism' rooted in the relations between rural communes in the Drafts of 1882 is ignored, his contemporary comment rejecting Phear's description of Indian villages as 'feudal' dismissed as inconclusive. (52) The happy ending in which Marx returned finally to the unilinearist fold reminds one of the well known 18th century tale about Voltaire on his death bed returning to the bosom of the Catholic church, the clergy at his bedside bearing faithful evidence of it.

It is time to recapitulate briefly what are in our view the elements of this new stage in Marx's thought. Already in the *Grundrisse* (1857-58) Marx had assumed the multiplicity of roads of social development in pre-capitalist societies. Hobsbawm's non-consecutive interpretation of it as 'three or four alternative routes out of primitive communal systems', each commencing in a different area, i.e. as 'analytical, though not chronological, stages in ... evolution', is important here. If accepted - it is already more sophisticated and realistic than any simple evolutionist model would have it. (53) Marx begins to shift his position from the 1873/4 period of extensive contacts with Russian scholars, revolutionaries and writings, but clearly and consciously from 1877. Under the impact of new evidence and experience Marx had come to accept the multiplicity of roads within a world in which capitalism existed and indeed became a dominant force. It meant (a) an anticipation of future histories of societies as necessarily uneven, interdependent and multi-directional; (b) the consequent inadequacy of the unilinear 'progressive' model both as a basis for historical analysis and for political judgement about the best way of promoting the socialist cause; (c) a re-evaluation of the place of peasantry and its specific social organisation in the revolutionary processes to come; (d) a new look at the ruling-class coalition and the role of the state in the type of societies which we call today 'developing societies'; (e) a new significance given to the de-centralisation of socio-political power within post revolutionary society in which the rejuvenation of 'archaic' communes was to play an important role.

Remarkably for a man who died in 1883, the Marx of those days was beginning to recognise for what they really are the real problems to be posed by 'developing' and post-revolutionary societies in the 20th century. To understand the scope of this achievement one would have to review the next three generations of conceptual blindness both in Marx's adversaries in the various 'modernisation' schools, and among his descendants. The ground is by now littered with self-fulfilling prophecies masquerading as historical necessities and laws of social science, especially in relation to the countryside. Marx, on the other hand, did lay the foundations for a socialist treatment of peasantry in which they did not merely figure as the fodder of history, and for a view of socialism which was more than proletarian. Marx's approach to a Russian peasantry he never saw proved on balance more realistic than that of the Russian marxists in 1917 - witness the NEP. Without idealising the 'muzhik' Marx showed better judgement even about the optimal parameters of collectivisation - consider the cases of successful collectivisation, e.g. contemporary Hungary.

How does the last stage in Marx's thought fit into the sequence of his work? To assume the very existence of that stage is to accept at least three major steps in Marx:

Early Marx of 1840s, a Middle Marx of 1850s and 1860s and the Late Marx of 1870s and 1880s. Unaccomplished as the last stage was to be left by his death in 1883, it was rich in premonitions of a new approach to global capitalism, its' not-so-capitalist companions on the world scene, and also of the prospects for socialism - issues and doubts our own generation came to call its own. That puts one record straight concerning Marx's thought. It also demolishes the very possibility of saving Marx's godly stature by making the whole of him or some of him into an 'icon'. Rigid divisions into stages will not do: he often returned to an earlier piece of writing to re-work it and/or incorporate it in a new way, e.g. the re-emergence of elements of the analysis of consciousness in *German Ideology* (1845-46) in the discussion of commodity fetishism in *Capital* Vol. 1 (1867) or signs of Late Marx in his earlier writings. (54) But it is high time to dispose of the ever recurring stupidity of discussing a synthetic 'Marx's view' while disregarding a couple of decades of intensive work and thought in between two quotations, just to discover with glee or despair 'contradictions'. He could be wrong, but for Heaven's sake, he could not be un-marxist. To admit to the specificity of Late Marx is (also) to see Marx in his creativity.

Finally such an interpretation of late Marx suggests that the development in his thought was neither eclectic nor the type of zig-zag Nikorforov offered: unilinearism, then something else (not quite certain what), then back to unilinearism. The movement seems much more consistent: (i) a sophisticated version of unilinearism with 'materialist' and dialectical assumptions forming a part of it; (ii) pre-capitalist multi linearity (bilinearity?) with the supposition that capitalism will iron it all out; (iii) the acceptance of multi-directionality within a capitalist dominated and socialist impregnated world of mutual dependence, indeed, heterogeneity resulting from that very interdependence.

Which brings us to the last question: was Marx human? To put it otherwise is to begin from the 'multi-dimensionality of Marx's theory which causes all but the dim-witted or prejudiced to respect and admire Marx as a thinker even when they do not agree with him', (55) and to add that we are dealing here not in 'pure thought' only. Marx is at one in his personal endeavour, ethical stand and intellectual analysis. He showed both remarkable tenacity and outstanding flexibility of mind. When, and in what way?

Since 1844, and through the trials of political defeats, hopes which were dashed, and extreme personal privation, Marx never deviated from the goals of serving socialist revolution the way he came to see it, as a young man. In human terms there was the winter of 1863 when, with the rent unpaid, wife ill and daughters out of school, for want of winter shoes, Marx carried on with his research and political action. There were more such winters, yet Marx kept fast, refusing a

variety of 'soft options' and 'offers' e.g. that of semi-governmental and well cushioned journalism. Such biographical evidence is inexplicable in terms of 'pure logic', yet it has a logic of its own without which Marx's life does not make much sense.

At a more theoretical level Marx's early writings are not only clues to his personal dreams and his insurrection against human poverty and oppression but also to his philosophical anthropology - his ideas about the essence of being human. It still offers the only available 'objective' base for socialist ethics, the alternative either to theology or simply to political expedience, i.e. the party line as defined by a current leader - an issue as urgent as it is understated in socialist thought: for it is not only an issue of spirit and discourse but of political action and of actually existing socialism (remember Poland).

While clearly impatient with banal sentimentality Marx was a humanist, an heir to the culture of the Enlightenment, in which he was steeped. His scholarship was a chosen tool in the service of a grand ethical design of liberation of human essence from its alienation caused by the grip of nature as well as by the man-made worlds of class-split societies. The best evidence of that side to Marx is his unwaning appeal today, which is, after all, nothing like simple adoration of a multiplication table. To purify 'mature' Marx from the 'philosophical' ethics of early Marx, or to divide aspects of his thought into separate boxes, is to do him indeed 'too much honour' (by someone else's code of practice) and 'too much injury' (by his own). (56)

Marx was not a god but a master craftsman, ever in the process of innovation. God remains unchanged by the process of creation and, as Aristotle once said, can think only of himself. Craftsmen change matter while changing themselves in the process. If an amateur is 'a man who thinks more of himself than of his subject' Marx was also a professional in his analytical skills and, therefore, self-critical to the utmost. For a man greatly admired by his own circle he was remarkably free from self-deification.

That is, in all probability, the root of the long public silence during the last decade of Marx's life. He was ailing, but then he was never a very healthy man. He was tired and at times depressed by the post-1871 revolutionary low in Europe, but fatigue and defeat were not new to him either. He was working on the further volumes of *Capital* but did fairly little to it. Biographers have faithfully re-written Mehring's view that Marx's last decade was 'slow death', failing to acknowledge that even Mehring actually described it as until 1882 'grossly exaggerated'. (57) 30,000 pages of notes in 10 years militate as much as the quality of the work he did against the solicitous remarks about Marx's failing powers. In the period directly following the publication of *Capital* Vol. I Marx faced critical comments and an increasing influx of 'stubborn data' which did not fully fit and had to be digested. He was re-thinking intensively, once more, his theoretical constructs and moving into new fields. Lack of lucidity is often the price of new depths in a path-breaking effort. Must a scholar be ill or senile not to 'rush into print' while still thinking through new conceptual possibilities?

To conclude, there was neither 'epistemological rupture' in Marx's thought nor decline, but constant transformation, uneven as such processes are. His last decade was a conceptual leap in the making, cut short by Marx's death. Marx was a man of intellect as much as a man of passion for social justice, a revolutionary who preferred revolutionaries to doctrinaire followers. The attempts to separate out a truly scientific, eternal and a-moral Marx from Marx the scholar, the fighter and the man are as silly as they are false. That is why one should not just read *Capital* but read Marx (*Capital* included) and also Goethe, Heine and Aeschylus whom Marx admired and made, together with the tale of Prometheus, into a part of his life. To give him his due as the greatest revolutionary scholar of his generation we should see him as he was, not as the icon drawn by his worshippers, his deifiers and his de-humanisers. To know him is to see him change. It is also to see in what sense he did not. To be 'on his side' is to strive to inherit

from him the best in him - his grasp of new worlds coming into being, his critical and self-critical faculty, the merciless honesty of his intellectual craftsmanship, his tenacity and his moral passion.

History Workshop Journal 1981 # 12

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks are given to those who by comments or help with collection of the evidence have contributed to this paper: Perry Anderson (Manchester), Zygrnunt Bauman (Leeds) Michael Barratt-Brown (Baslow), Philip Corrigan (London), Arghiri Emmanuel (Paris), Tania Khizhniak (Moscow), Harry Magdoff (New York), M. Mchedlov (Moscow), Sidney Mintz (Baltimore), Derek Sayers (Glasgow), Paul Sweezy (New York), Eric Wolf (New York), and the editorial collective of History Workshop Journal.

1. K. Marx, *Capital*, Harmondsworth 1979, vol. I, p.91. The same idea was expressed by Marx also as a heuristic device, specifically modelled after the natural sciences: 'Human anatomy contains a key to the anatomy of the ape ... [which] can be understood only after the animal of the higher order is already known'. K. Marx, *Grundrisse*, Harmondsworth 1973, p.105. (Translation slightly amended).
2. See 'The British Rule in India' written in 1853, K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Moscow 1973, vol. I. E. Hobsbawm described the concept as 'the chief innovation in the table of historical periods' introduced in the period when *Grundrisse* was written, 1857/8. K. Marx, *Pre-Capitalist Economic Formations*, London p.32 (Introduction). For alternative views see also Godelier's preface to *Sur les Sociétés Pre-Capitalistes*, Paris 1970; L. Krader, *The Asiatic Mode of Production*, Assen 1975, and M. Sawyer, 'The Concept of the Asiatic Mode of Production and Contemporary Marxism', in S. Avineri (ed.), *Varieties of Marxism*, The Hague 1977. For a good summary of the Soviet debate by a contemporary Soviet scholar see V. Nikoforov, *Vostok i Vsemirnaya Istoryia*, Moscow 1975.
3. G. Hegel, *The Philosophy of History*, London 1878, p.168. The organic metaphor is apt, for no society is assumed to be stationary in the mechanical sense, 'stagnation' means the overwhelming cyclicity of processes within it.
4. Russia lacked, of course, 'hydraulic' determinants. It was the impact of extensive militarisation and conquest which was assumed to have shaped Russian state and society in an 'oriental' manner. In his general explanation of such types of society Marx's stress moved with time from the significance of irrigation-based agriculture to the characteristics of rural self-sufficiency and of the state.
5. The attraction of the concept Oriental Despotism as a supplement to the dynamic model of *Capital* is still potent. For well argued cases for and against the contemporary usage of the concept within Marxist analysis, an issue which does not directly concern us here, see U. Melotti, *Marx and the Third World*, London 1977, and P. Anderson, *Lineages of the Absolutist State*, London 1970, Appendix B; R. Bahro, *The Alternative in Eastern Europe*, London 1977 has considerably blunted the conceptual edge of the term by using it as a residual catch-all category for all which is not capitalist (or on its way to become so). For discussion of the recent stage of the debate in USSR see Nikoforov, *Vostok* , and E. Gellner, *Soviets Against Wittfogel*, (in publication). The most important alternative explanation of Marx's attitude to heterogeneity of societal developments is that by Hobsbawrn, *Formations*, pp.36-8 who assumes that with the

singular exception of the transformation of feudalism to capitalism Marx's 'stages' of social development have to be understood as analytical and not chronological.

6. K. Marx and F. Engels, *Sochineniya*, Moscow 1961, vol. 18, p.51 (written by Marx in 1872).
7. R. Samuel, 'Sources of Marxist History', *New Left Review*, 1980, no. 120, p.36. See also Nikoforov, *Vostok*, pp.81-103.
8. S R. Nisbet, *The Social Philosophers*, p.81. Albans 1973, p.11. He has described the issue of community as the axis of the history of Western social philosophy.
9. H. Wada, 'Karl Marx and Revolutionary Russia', (see below). Wada's achievement stands out in particular when compared with the work of analysts who 'knew it all', were aware of most of the evidence, yet made little of it. See for example, the editorial comments in P. Blackstock and B. Hoselitz (eds.), K. Marx and F. Engels, *The Russian Menace to Europe*, Glencoe, Illinois 1952.
10. M. Rubel and M. Manale, *Marx without Myth*, Oxford 1975, p.252.
11. The book referred to is *The Development of Capitalism in Russia*, and the populists selected for punishment in it were Danielson (Nikolai-on) and Vorontsev (V. V.). Lenin, whose admiration of Chernyshevskii was profound, but tempered by the tactical needs of struggle against the Socialist Revolutionary Party (which claimed Chernyshevskii's heritage) solving it by naming Chernyshevskii 'a revolutionary democrat', quite unrelated, at least semantically, to 'populism'. This position was often followed by official Soviet publications. It is as if Lenin or Martov were to be renamed 'Proletarian Jacobins', by somebody who does not like their contemporary heirs or their marxism, and about as illuminating. For discussion see A. Walicki, *The Controversy over Capitalism*, Oxford 1969, pp.16-22.
12. The word *volya* meant in C19 Russian both will and liberty. The second translation is probably closer to the original meaning but the first is more usually used, (e.g. Venturi - see below). We shall keep to the first term to simplify identification.
13. For studies of the Russian populist tradition available in English see F. Venturi, *Roots of Revolution*, London 1960. I. Berlin, *Russian Thinkers*, Harmondsworth 1979 and Walicki, *The Controversy*. Venturi explores also the split between Chernyshevskii and Herzen - of major significance for the delineation of the specific revolutionary line within the general populist fold. See also T. Dan, *The Origins of Bolshevism*, London 1964, chs. 3, 6, and 7 and L. Haimson, *The Russian Marxists and the Origins of Bolshevism*, Boston 1966. Contrary to a generally held view, the Russian populists did not reject industrialisation but wanted it of medium size, controlled and adjusted to regional needs. See Walicki, *The Controversy*, pp.114-116.
14. For example, the members of the terror squads often refused to run after a terrorist attack was made, and stayed to be arrested to give one more service to the Revolution by defending it at their trial.
15. V. Lenin, 'Two Utopias', *Selected Works*, Moscow 1960, vol. 16, p.359 (written in 1912).
16. *Statisuka zemlevladeniya*, 1905, Petersburg 1907. The figures referred to the 50 *gubernyas* of European Russia, i.e. excluded Russian Poland and Caucasus.
17. For further discussion of the Russian commune see G. T. Robinson, *Rural Russia under the Old Regime*, New York 1979; V. Aleksandrov, *Sei'skaya obshchina v Rossii*, Moscow 1976; T. Shanin, *The Awkward Class*, Oxford 1972, ch. 2. For the best discussion of the general issue of the commune, see L. and V. Danilov in *Obshchina v Afrika*, Moscow 1978, pp.9-60.

18. See Venturi, *Roots*, chs. 20, 21. Also Dan, *Origins*, chs. 6, 7 and Sand Haimson, *Russian Marxists*. For a good self description of the Black Repartition group see L. Deich in V. Nevskii (ed.), *Istoriko-Ravolyutsionnyi Sbornik*, Leningrad 1924, vol. 2, pp.280-350.

19. *Archiv*, K. Marks i F. Engelsa, 1924, book I, p.271. It is interesting to note how much their analysis matches that of the 'legal Marxists', i.e. the anti-revolutionary trend of Russian 'evolutionists', close to its Liberals, e.g. M. Tugan Baranovskii, *Russkaya Fabrika*, St. Petersburg 1901, vol. I, ch. V.

20. Central to that line of argument were the works and views of B. Chicherin adapted in the latter generations by P. Miliukov, K. Kocharovskii as well as by G. Plekhanov and I. Chernyshev on the marxist side. The view was often referred to as the 'state school'. It was opposed by an equally impressive group of scholars and political theorists of whom N. Chernyshevskii and I. Belyaev were the most prominent in Marx's own generation. Marx himself spoke up sharply against Chicherin (Marx, etc., *Sochineniya*, vol. 33, p.482). For a good historiography of the debate see Alexandrov, *Sel'skaya*, pp.3-46.

21. Marx wrote the passage in 'The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte' (1852) referring to France but deleted it in the reprint of 1869. The dates are significant for reasons discussed in the text.

22. *Archiv*, K. Marks i F. Engels, from which the quotations with page numbers in brackets are taken, in the following three paragraphs.

23. Wada, see below p.88.

24. See below p.90.

25. Ryazanov in *Archiv*, p.267. For a Western equivalent of that view see Marx, *The Russian Menace*, p.266.

26. *Archiv*, p.267.

27. E.g. the 1905 appeal of the Saratov Bolsheviks and the call of Nikodim (A. Shestakov), the chief of the agrarian section of the Bolshevik Moscow committee, against the new agrarian programme - treated as capitulation to the populist petty bourgeoisie.

28. See, for example, Marx's 1862 uncritical adoption of the description of Taiping Revolutionaries in China as fanatical mobsters without any political goals and 'a greater scourge to the population than the old rulers'. S. Avineri, *K. Marx on Colonialism and Modernisation*, New York 1969, p.224.

29. (Italics added) Letters of Nov. 2nd and 30th, 1876, Rubel, *Marx without Myth*, pp.229 231.

30. As above, p.254.

31. From the 1847 Speech about the independence of Poland, K. Marks i F. Engels, *Sochineniya*, Moscow 1955, vol. 4, p.273.

32. The quotation comes from Marx's letter of 21.3.1881 to his daughter. For it, as well as Marx's view about the 'Black Repartition', see Rubel, *Marx without Myth*, p.323.

33. W. Weintraub, 'Marx and Russian Revolutionaries', *Cambridge Journal* 1949, vol. 3, p.501.

34. The Third Thesis of Feuerbach, Marx, etc., *Selected Works*, vol. I, p.13.

35. Hobsbawm, *Formations*, p.53.

36. *Arkhiv*, p.272 (The quotation adopted from Maurer). For Engels's views see his paper 'Marka', written in 1882, Marx, etc., *Sochineniya*, vol. 19, pp.335-7.

37. Marx etc., *Selected Works*, vol. 3, p.331.

38. As above, p.334 (quoted after Morgan).

39. F. Engels, *Anti-Duhring*; London 1943, p.203.

40. Marx etc., *Sochineniya*, vols. 21-22 (publications) and 36-9 (correspondence). Thanks are due here to Professor M. Mchedlov of Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute in Moscow for ascertaining that point. He has pointed out that, on the other hand, Engels did not edit out that term from the new editions of *Anti-Duhring* in 1886 and 1894, which is open to a variety of interpretations. The explanation offered by Hobsbawm (Hobsbawm, *Formations*, p.51) and by some Soviet scholars that the Asiatic Mode is simply substituted by the broader concept of Archaic Formation does not quite meet the case, i.e. of the close correlation between the disappearance of the concept of Oriental despotism from Engels's work and the date of Marx's death.

41. Marx, etc., *Selected Works*, vol. 2, p.388.

42. As above, pp.387-8, 390, 395.

43. As above, pp.403-4.

44. As above, pp.395-412.

45. Relentless pressure, mixing flattery and cajolery, was applied to enlist Engels's authority in the squabbles within the Russian left, especially by Plekhanov, for which see *Perepiska, Marksia i Engel'sa*, Moscow 1951, pp.324-346. Engels had on the whole explicitly rejected those pressures, and had shown for a time considerable suspicion of Plekhanov (Walicki, *The Controversy*, pp.181-3) but was, no doubt, influenced by those links nevertheless.

46. Engels's 1892 letter to Danielson in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Moscow 1956, p.527.

47. Marx etc., *Selected Works*, vol. 3, pp.460, 469.

48. Hobsbawm, *Formations*, pp.60-62.

49. See Karl Marx, *Early Writings*, London 1963.

50. L. Althusser and E. Balibar, *Reading Capital*, London 1975. For a British version of the same see B. Hindess and P. Hirst, *Pre-capitalist Modes of Production*, London 1975. The next step came when Althusser had discovered Hegelian traces in Capital itself and therefore re-timed Marx's full 'maturity' to 'The Critique of the Gotha Programme', i.e. 1875 (Marx's age 57). L. Althusser, *Lenin and Philosophy*, New York, 1971, pp.93-4.

51. Nikoforov, *Vostok*; esp. pp.145, 149.

52. *Arkhiv*, p.273. It seems that the only reasonable interpretation of evidence is indeed that of Hobsbawm: 'There is - at least on Marx's part - no inclination to abandon the "Asiatic Mode" ... and quite certainly a deliberate refusal to reclassify it as feudal'. Hobsbawm, *Formations*, p.58.

53. Hobsbawm, *Formations*, pp.32 and 36-37.

54. For example, Marx's comment about situations in which market penetration may reinforce 'archaic' forms of production in *Capital*, vol. I.

55. Hobsbawm, *Formations*, p.16.

56. The quotation is Marx's own words in self defence against a unilinear interpretation of his writing, 'Letter to Otechestvennye Zapiski' (1877/8), Avineri, *Varieties of Marxism*, pp.467-9.

57. F. Mehring, *Karl Marx: the Story of his Life*, London 1936 (First published 1918), pp.501, 526.

Marx, Marxism and the Agrarian Question II: Marx and Revolutionary Russia

Haruki Wada

INTRODUCTION

In Japan since the late 1960s Marx's views of Russia in his later years have been a subject of repeated discussion. Indeed, they have been pursued with greater enthusiasm in Japan than elsewhere. Many papers have been written on the subject, and several books have appeared dealing exclusively with it, including my own, published in 1975. (1) Needless to say, the motives for taking up this matter differ from one writer to another. All manner of motivations - a desire to understand the true image of the history of Russian social thought, an attempt to identify the place in the history occupied by Plekhanov who introduced his version of 'Marxism' into Russia, a wish to discover in Marx's studies of Russia in his later years a key to the structure of underdeveloped capitalist economies, an effort to re-evaluate Russian Populism on the basis of the similarities between Marx's view of Russia in his later years and the Populists', a growing interest in Russian peasant communes, and even an attempt to find a recipe for rescuing the highly industrialized Japanese society from the depths of its contradictions.

It is well known that the writings of Marx himself from which we can infer his thesis on Russia in his later years are the 'Letter to the Editor of *Otechestvennye Zapiski*' and the letter to V. Zasulich and its four different drafts. Each of these manuscripts had surprisingly strange histories prior to their publication.

To begin with, the so-called 'Letter to the Editor of *Otechestvennye Zapiski*' - the manuscript of a letter that was not completed and never sent - was discovered after Marx's death by Engels who in March 1884 asked the Group for the Emancipation of Labour, which had been formed the year before, to publish it. (2) However, Zasulich and others in the group, in spite of their avowed desire to be the disciples of Marx in Russia, spent as many as 7 months before responding to Engels with a promise that the letter, having been translated into Russian, would soon be printed; (3) but the promise was never fulfilled. Bent on the publication of this letter, Engels tried through N. F. Danielson to have it published in a legal Populist magazine inside Russia but was unsuccessful. (4) Finally the letter was published in *Vestnik Narodnoi Voli*, Vol. 5, December 1886, with this editorial note: 'Although we obtained a copy of this letter much earlier, we have been withholding its publication because we were informed that Friedrich Engels handed the letter to other people for publication in the Russian language.' (5) Two years later, in 1888, Marx's letter was also printed in *Yuridicheskii Vestnik*, a legal magazine published inside Russia.

The first response to the letter was made by Gleb Uspenskii, a novelist with Populist leanings, in the form of an essay titled 'A Bitter Reprof,' in which he deeply lamented the incapability of the Russian intellectuals to respond faithfully to Marx's reproof and advice. (6) Thereafter in the 1890s, Plekhanov, Lenin and other Marxists, in opposition to the Populists who found in this letter a strong support for their line, insisted that in this letter Marx did not say anything definite about the direction in which Russian society should proceed. (7)

Somewhat similar conditions surrounded the letter to Zasulich and its draft manuscripts; that is, the recipient, Plekhanov and others close to her kept the letter's contents to themselves, and, even when asked about the letter, kept replying that they knew nothing about it. The draft manuscripts of this letter were discovered in 1911 by D.B. Riazanov, who with the help of N.

Bukharin succeeded in deciphering them in 1913. But then the manuscripts were left for a decade. In 1923, after the Revolution was over, B.I. Nikolaevskii, a Menshevik in exile, found the letter's text in papers belonging to Aksel'rod and published it the following year. Upon reading the text, Riazanov also published the text in the same year as well as the drafts of the letter in Russian in the *Arkhiv K. Marks'a & F. Engel'sa*, and in 1926, in the original French, in the *Marx-Engels Archiv*, Vol. 1 (8)

Neither of the discoverers of the letter attached any special theoretical or philosophical significance to the new material. Nikolaevskii regarded the letter as a political utterance of Marx (9) while Riazanov said, in addition to a similar remark, that the letter and its drafts merely exemplified a marked decline in Marx's scholastic capability. (10) In marked contrast, Socialist-Revolutionaries in exile enthusiastically welcomed the publication of these new materials. V. Zenzinov, for instance, insisted that the program Marx delineated in this letter was in perfect accord with 'what has been developed by Russian revolutionary Populism' and it offered testimony to the fact that on the question of the future of peasant communes 'Marx definitely was on the side of Populism.' (11) V.M. Chernov, too, wrote that the publication of the 'letter to Zasulich which has been stored under a paperweight for more than 40 years' had brought the debate to a conclusion and that 'the program described in this letter is exactly what forms the foundation of the S-Rs' theory of peasant revolution, agrarian demands and rural tactics.' (12)

The first person to support this letter inside the Soviet Union was A. Sukhanov who also strongly urged that the village commune should be used as a means for promoting collectivization in agriculture. (13) Several other writers made similar arguments in the Party organ *Bolshevik* in early 1928, (14) but in the world of historians no such opinion was heard.

It was not until 1929 that the letter was discussed on a fully theoretical level by M. Potash in a paper entitled 'Views of Marx and Engels on Populist Socialism in Russia.' In this paper, Potash clearly pointed out that the concluding passage of Marx's letter to Zasulich - in order for the village commune to serve as 'the point of support of a social regeneration of Russia ... the poisonous influences that attack it from all sides must be eliminated, and then the normal conditions of a spontaneous development insured' - was the passage that was 'especially wide open to question.' (15) A strong rebuttal of this view came from A. Ryndich, who maintained that Marx obtained his view of the Russian village commune as a 'result of the long and detailed studies of the primary sources on Russia after the Reform,' and thus emphasized the significance of the concluding passage of Marx's letter to Zasulich. (16) However, in his rejoinder that accompanied Ryndich's paper, Potash remarked that Ryndich's piece was being printed precisely because 'it reveals the true nature of all those whose stance is that of a revision of Lenin's view.' (17) In the crucial year 1929, Potash represented the mainstream.

I

Marx's attitude towards Russian populism at the time of the publication of Volume one of *Capital* in 1867 seems to have been utterly negative. In appended footnote nine at the end of this first German edition of Capital Marx writes high-handedly:

If, in the European continent, influences of capitalist production which destroy the human species ... were to continue to develop hand in hand with competition in the sizes of national armies, state security issues ... etc., then rejuvenation of Europe may become possible with the use of a whip and through forced mixture with the Kalmyks as Herzen, that half-Russian and perfect Moskovich, has so emphatically foretold. (This gentleman with an ornate style of writing - to remark in passing - has discovered

'Russian' communism not inside Russia but instead in the work of Haxthausen, a councillor of the Prussian Government). (18)

Herzen's view that the Russian village commune was unique to the Slavic world was considered merely laughable by Marx at that time. Marx thought it was to be found everywhere, and was no different from what had already been dissolved in Western Europe:

Everything, to the minutest details, is completely the same as in the ancient Germanic community. All that has to be added in the case of the Russians are ... (i) the patriarchal nature ... of their community and (ii) the collective responsibility in such matters as payment of taxes to the state ... These are already on their way to decay. (19)

Something like this can't form a basis for a socialist development - this, I am sure, was the way Marx looked at the Russian peasant commune. For he wrote in the preface to the first German edition of *Capital*, 'The country that is more developed industrially only shows to the less developed, the *image of its own future!*' (emphasis added). (20) At this stage, it appears, he supposed that Russia, like Germany, would follow the example of England.

Marx's thinking, however, began to change once he mastered the Russian language and became able to pursue his Russian studies using primary sources, and especially once he came across the studies of N.G. Chernyshevskii. Needless to say, this change in Marx's attitude towards Russian Populism did not take place overnight. Marx first wanted to study the Russian language in October 1869 when N.F. Danielson, a young Russian who asked his permission to translate *Capital* into Russian, sent him a copy of V.V. Bervi-Flerovskii's newly published book, *The Situation of the Working Class in Russia*; Marx felt he would like to read this solid book by himself. He immediately started learning Russian, and learned it very quick; by February 1870 he managed to read as many as 150 pages of Flerovskii's book. (21) Marx found Flerovskii's book completely free from the sort of 'Russian "optimism" that was evident in Herzen:

Naturally, he is caught up by fallacies such as *la perfectibilite de la proprieté perfectible de la Nation russe, et le principe providentiel de la propriété communale dans sa forme russe*. [The perfectable property of the Russian Nation, and the providential principle of communal property in its Russian form.] This, however, does not matter at all. Examination of his writing convinces one that an extremely dreadful social revolution ... is inevitable and imminent in Russia. This is good news. (22)

In spite of Flerovskii's Populism, Marx thus appraised his descriptions of the social realities in Russia very highly, because they clarified the inevitability of a Russian revolution.

Having finished reading Flerovskii's work, Marx then tackled an article, 'Peasant Reform and Communal Ownership of Land (1861-1870)', which appeared in *Narodnoe Delo*, No. 2, an organ of the Russian Section of the International, the organization which, through its member Utin, once asked Marx to convey its membership application to the First International. Marx felt friendly towards Utin and his group because of their opposition to Bakunin and Herzen, but his attitude toward their Populist view of the Russian village commune was basically unchanged. While reading this paper, Marx wrote in a word of rejection, 'Asinus(!)', at various points. And beside a passage where the differences in the development of communities in Russia and the West are discussed, he wrote down the following comment: '*Dieser Kohl kommt darauf heraus, dass russische Gemeineigentum ist vertraglich mit russische Barbarei, aber nicht mit burgerlicher Civilization!*' [From this rubbish, it emerges that Russian communal property is compatible with Russian barbarism, but not with bourgeois civilisation]. (23)

It is clear from this that at this stage Marx continued to find nothing significant in the Russian village commune.

However, his view began to change as a result of the discussions he had with German Lopatin, who visited Marx in July 1870 and who, while staying with Marx in order to work on the Russian translation of *Capital*, talked very highly of Chernyshevskii. Marx first read 'Comments on John Stuart Mill's *Principles of Political Economy*' by Chernyshevskii and found the author generally very capable. He then seems to have started to read a paper of Chernyshevskii's on the peasantry, though we do not know which particular one this was. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that reading this paper was a turning point; Marx began to see Populism and the village commune of Russia in a different perspective. (24)

This can be seen from a letter by Elizaveta Dmitrieva Tomanovskaia, a member of the Russian Section of the International, who visited Marx towards the end of 1870. In this letter dated January 7, 1871, Tomanovskaia writes: 'As regards the alternative view you hold about the destinies of the peasant commune in Russia, unfortunately its dissolution and transformation into small holdings is more than probable. All the measures of the government ... are geared to the sole purpose of introduction of individual ownership through abolition of the practice of collective guarantee.' She asked if Marx had already read the book by Haxthausen; she offered to send him a copy in case he had not. 'This book,' she wrote, 'includes many facts and verified data about the organization and management of the peasant commune. In the various papers on the communal ownership of land you are reading now, you may notice that Chernyshevskii frequently refers to and quotes from this book.'(25)

This clearly shows that Marx either told or wrote to Tomanovskaia that he was reading Chernyshevskii's paper on the Russian peasant commune, and that he thought it worthwhile to consider the question raised by Chernyshevskii - that is, the Populist question - about the 'alternative': was the communal ownership of land going to be dissolved?; Or was it going to survive to form the Lynchpin of Russia's social regeneration? Marx's view had changed a great deal.

We do not know whether Marx at this time was given Haxthausen's book by Tomanovskaia or not, but there is no doubt that he now became interested in the conservative councillor of the Prussian Government whom he once scoffed at. It is therefore not a mere accident that Marx wrote at the end of his letter to L. Kugelmann dated February 4, 1871: 'Once you told me about a book by Haxthausen which deals with the ownership of land in (I presume) Westphalian. I would be very happy if you kindly sent me that same book.' (26)

However, Marx's Russian studies which had advanced this far were now interrupted for a considerable time by the struggle of the Paris Commune and, after its defeat, by the internal fight within the International. It was only after the Hague Congress of September 1872 that Marx returned to theory and the Russian question.

When he was able to spare time for his theoretical works again, Marx prepared the second German edition of *Capital*, Volume one and published it in early 1873. Except for some rearrangements of chapters and sections, there are not many major changes from the first edition. Important among these few corrections are: (1) the deletion of the exclamation mark (!) from the passage in the preface we quoted earlier - 'The country that is more developed industrially only shows, to the less developed, the image of its own future!'; and (2) the deletion of footnote nine at the end of the volume in which Marx, as we saw earlier, sneered at Herzen and his 'Russian communism.' In addition to these changes, Marx in the 'Postscript to the Second Edition' paid a glowing tribute to Chernyshevskii by calling him 'the great Russian scholar and critic.' (27) The fact that Marx deleted his disdainful remark about Herzen's Populism and,

furthermore, added a eulogy to the economics of Chernyshevskii clearly reveals that his attitude was undergoing a profound change.

In the period from the end of 1872 to sometime in 1873, Marx read an anthology by Chernyshevskii, *Essays on Communal Ownership of Land*, published in Geneva immediately before. Of the nine articles collected in the anthology, the two most important are the review (written in 1857) of Haxthausen's book, *Studien über die inneren Zustände, das Volksleben und insbesondere die landlichen Einrichtungen Russlands* [Studies on the internal conditions, the life of the People and in particular the agrarian arrangements of Russia) and the article entitled, 'Criticism of Philosophical Prejudices against the Communal Ownership of Land' (1858). In these articles Chernyshevskii pointed out that the communal ownership of land in Russia was by no means a 'certain mysterious feature peculiar only to the Great Russian nature,' but was something that survived till that day as 'a result of the unfavourable circumstances of historical development' in Russia which were drastically different from those in Western Europe. But, anything that has a negative side ought to have a positive side as well. Among 'these harmful results of our immobility' there are some which are 'becoming extremely important and useful given the development of economic movements which exist in Western Europe,' and which 'have created the sufferings of the proletariat.' (28) Among these, thought Chernyshevskii, was the communal ownership of land:

When certain social phenomena in a certain nation reach an advanced stage of development, the evolution of phenomena up to this same stage in other backward nations can be achieved much faster than in the advanced nation ... This acceleration consists of the fact that the development of certain social phenomena in backward nations, thanks to the influences of the advanced nation, skips an intermediary stage and jumps directly from a low stage to a higher stage. (29)

On the basis of such a theoretical premise, Chernyshevskii thought that, given the development of the advanced West ... it would be possible for Russia to leap from communal ownership of land directly to socialism. Chernyshevskii sums up his view in the following terms:

History is like a grandmother; it loves the younger grandchildren. To the late comers (*tarde venientibus*) it gives not the bones (*ossa*) but the marrow of the bones (*medullam ossium*), while Western Europe has hurt her fingers badly in her attempts to break the bones. (30)

Marx was deeply impressed by this view. (31) It is my contention that Marx went as far as to accept it as rational, and also to conceive it possible, that given the existence of the advanced West as a precondition, Russia could start out from its village commune and proceed immediately to socialism. Only by this inference can we reach a coherent understanding of his view in 1875.

That Marx was deeply interested in the question of the Russian village commune is evident from his letter to Danielson dated March 22, 1873, in which he asked for information on the origins of the village commune. (32) Of the books which Danielson sent to Marx in response to this request, *Materials about Artels in Russia* (1873) and a book by Skaldin, *In a Faraway Province and in the Capital* (1870), were of importance, and Marx read these two volumes in earnest. (33)

II

The new view which Marx formulated on the basis of his studies up to that time can be inferred from a correction he made in the French edition of *Capital*, published in January 1875, and from an article by Engels written in April 1875, 'The Social Conditions in Russia.'

Let us first consider the correction made in the French edition of *Capital*. There is in Chapter 26, 'The Secret of Primitive Accumulation,' a passage which reads as follows in both the first and second German editions:

The expropriation of the agricultural producers, of the peasant, from the soil, is the basis of the whole process. The history of this expropriation, in different countries, assumes different aspects, and runs through its various phases in different orders of succession, and at different periods. In England alone, which we take as our example, has it the classic form. (34)

In the French edition this passage was struck out and replaced by a new one:

At the bottom of the capitalist system is, therefore, the radical separation of the producer from the means of production ... The basis of this whole evolution is the expropriation of the peasants ... It has been accomplished in a final form only in England ... but all the other countries of Western Europe are going through the same movement. (35)

An obvious implication of this correction is that the English form of the expropriation of the peasants is applicable only to Western Europe, or to put it differently, Eastern Europe and Russia may follow a completely different path of evolution. Thereafter Marx quotes only from the French edition whenever he refers to the passage above.

The essay by Engels was a by-product of his polemic with P.N. Tkachev. The polemic was started by Engels when, by way of criticizing P.L. Lavrov, he took up Tkachev's pamphlet, 'The Tasks of Revolutionary Propaganda in Russia' (1874), and ridiculed him as a 'green schoolboy'. (36) In a furious rage, Tkachev responded with the publication of a German pamphlet, 'Offener Brief an Herrn Friedrich Engels', [Open Letter to Mr Frederick Engels] in Zurich at the end of 1874.

Upon reading this open letter by Tkachev, Marx handed it over to Engels with a brief note written on it:

Go ahead and let him have enough of a beating, but in cheerful mood. This is so absurd that it seems Bakunin has had a hand in it. Pyotr Tkachev wishes above all else to prove to his readers that you are treating him as your opponent, and for that purpose he discovers in your argument points that do not exist at all. (37)

These words of Marx show that he found in Tkachev's open letter to Engels something reminiscent of the argument of Bakunin, and advised that Engels had better treat him as an idiotic opponent.

I deduce that Marx read Tkachev's 'The Tasks of Revolutionary Propaganda in Russia' only after he read this open letter to Engels. Marx left behind him his copy of the former pamphlet in which he underlined passages here and there. (38) Reading this pamphlet he realized that Tkachev was fairly well versed in the social realities in Russia. In contrast to Engels who wrote of Tkachev's assertion that he 'could not wait for a revolution' 'Why, then, do you gentlemen keep chattering and making us sick of it? Damn you! Why don't you start one right away?', Marx

was more impressed by the accompanying analysis which formed the basis of Tkachev's assertion that he could not wait.

Of course, we cannot expect this social condition, which is convenient to us, to last for a long period of time. We are somehow, though stealthily and sluggishly, advancing along the path of economic development. This development now underway is subject to the same law and is in the same direction as the economic development of Western European countries. The village commune has already begun to dissolve ... Among the peasantry, there are being formed different classes of kulaks - peasant aristocrats ... Thus, there already exist in our country at present all the conditions necessary for the formation of the strong conservative classes of farmer-landholders and large tenants on the one hand, of the capitalist bourgeoisie in banking, commerce and industry, on the other. As these classes are being formed and reinforced, the chance of success for a violent revolution grows more and more dubious. Either now, or many years ahead, or never! Today, the situation is on our side, but ten years or twenty years from now, it definitely will become an obstacle to us. (40)

This argument of Tkachev is half way between that of Chernyshevskii and the party, People's Will. After his encounter with this view, Marx realized that anyone who wanted to debate with Tkachev would have to deal seriously with the question of the Russian village commune and present his own view of Russian society. We have thus good reason to suppose that it was because Marx gave advice of this kind that Engels's rebuttal to Tkachev took an unexpected turn in its latter half in choosing to confront the 'social conditions in Russia' in the fifth article of the series 'Literature in Emigration.' The materials as well as the logic which Engels used in the writing of this article were provided almost entirely by Marx. Although it bears the signature of Engels alone, the article's major contents consist of the conclusions which Marx and Engels jointly reached after discussion. Engels's article is well known for its attack upon Tkachev's supposed failure to understand that socialism was only possible once the social forces of production had reached a certain level of development. It has generally been read as an endorsement of the later Plekhanov position against the populists. However, a close reading of his argument in the fifth article reveals that it is quite consistent with the new position that Marx had adopted from Chernyshevskii. The difficulty of interpretation arises from Engels's initial unawareness of Marx's new view, his lack of sympathy for the position Tkachev represented, heightened on both sides by polemical exaggerations in the course of the debate. It was this that led Engels to insist that 'if there was anything which can save the Russian system of communal property, and provide the conditions for it to be transformed into a really living form, it is the proletarian revolution in Western Europe.' This of course was an exaggeration, in support of his point that 'it is pure hot air' for Mr. Tkachev to say that the Russian peasants, although 'owners of property' are 'nearer to socialism' than the propertyless workers of Western Europe. (41) This was a product of his experiences in the First International which led him to see Bakunin behind Tkachev and to stand out against Bakunin's 'Panslavism', in defence of Western European hegemony in the international proletarian movement. I believe that on this point too there was virtually no difference between Marx and Engels. Russia had two alternative paths of development to choose from: it could either follow the path of capitalist development or the route that led directly from the village commune to socialism. Chernyshevskii was well aware that Russia had embarked upon the former path, yet considered it possible for Russia to reject this path and pursue the latter course, without mentioning this precondition. Tkachev also insisted that since capitalist development was already underway in Russia, a revolution must be started at the earliest possible opportunity so as to enable it to switch paths before it became too late. Marx and Engels, accepting Chernyshevskii's assertion, came to think that it would be possible for Russia to start from its village commune and jump directly to socialism. But their treatment of

Tkachev's thesis was affected both by the memory of their own struggle with Bakunin and Nechaev as well as the exaggerated way in which Tkachev expressed it. They therefore argued against Tkachev, that a precondition for the success of the communal path would be a victorious proletarian revolution in Western Europe and the material aid this revolution would offer. It thus seems that in reaching this conclusion, Marx and Engels did not see any difference between their positions.

III

In the period from 1875 through 1876, Marx made further progress in his Russian studies. He read *Die Agrarverfassung Russlands* [The agrarian Constitution of Russia], a book by Haxthausen, *Communal Ownership of Land in Russia* by A.I. Koshelev, Appendix A of *Statism and Anarchy* by Bakunin, 'Various Problems of Russian Agriculture,' an article by A.N. Engel'gardt, a voluminous Report of the Committee of Direct Tax and other materials, and made careful notes of their contents. Of these, Marx was particularly impressed by the criticisms which Bakunin directed at the patriarchal aspect and the closed character of the village commune.

After a brief interruption, Marx in the spring of 1877 started to read such works as *Outlines of the History of Village Communes in Russia and Other European Countries* by A.I. Vasil'chikov and *Outline of the History of Village Communes in Northern Russia* by P.A. Sokolovskii. (43)

The year 1877 saw the outbreak of the Russo-Turkish War. The desperate battles the Russian forces had to fight in its first phases led to the expectation of another 'Sevastopol' and the hope that a revolution would follow soon after the Russian defeat. On September 27 of the same year, Marx wrote to F.A. Sorge:

This crisis is a new turning point for the history of Europe. Russia - I have studied the situation in this country on the basis of official and non-official original sources in the Russian language - has for a long period been on the brink of revolution. All the factors for this are already present. The brave Turks, by the hard blow they struck against not only the Russian army and Russian finance but also the dynasty in command of the army, have advanced the date of explosion by a number of years. The change will begin with a constitutional comedy, *puis if y aura un beau tapage* [Then all hell will break loose]. If Mother Nature is not extraordinarily hard on us, we will perhaps be able to live long enough to see the delightful day of the ceremony. The revolution this time starts from the East, that same East which we have so far regarded as the invincible support and reserve of counter-revolution. (44)

We see how excited Marx was at the prospect of Russian defeat in the Turkish war, followed by a Russian revolution, and then a revolution in Europe. However, these expectations were miserably disappointed. Somehow or other, Russia managed to reduce the Fort of Plevna by the end of 1877, and drove Turkey to admit its defeat in March the following year. In the face of this turn of events, Marx had to admit that 'things have turned out differently from our expectations.' (45)

According to a widely accepted hypothesis, Marx is supposed to have written his so-called 'Letter to the Editor of Otechestvennye Zapiski' sometime in November 1877. This hypothesis, however, is completely without foundation. It is more likely that Marx wrote this letter at the end of 1878 after his hopes of imminent Russian revolution had already been disappointed. My hypothesis is supported by Marx's letter of November 15, 1878 to Danielson, which reads in part as follows:

As regards the polemics which B. Chicherin and several others are directing against me, I haven't seen anything other than what you sent me in 1877 ... an article by N.I. Ziber written as a response to Yu. Zhukovskii and another article, I guess it was, by Mikhailov - both of which appeared in the *Otechestvennye Zapiski*. Professor M.M. Kovalevskii who is staying here has told me that a fairly animated debate is going on in connection with *Capital*. (46)

The 'Letter to the Editor of *Otechestvennye Zapiski*' was written as a refutation of an article entitled 'Karl Marx before the Tribunal of Mr. Zhukovskii' which Mikhailovskii published in the tenth issue of the same journal in 1877 under the signature of 'H.M.' If Marx had actually finished writing his letter or if he, after having started to write some part of it, had chosen not to finish it and send it off, then it would have been nearly impossible for him to refer to this article inaccurately as an 'article, I guess it was, by Mikhailov.' It would be far more logical for us to assume that he was tempted, partly perhaps stimulated by the conversations with Professor Kovalevskii, to read the article by Mikhailovskii and that, only after reading the article, should he have felt that he should not keep silent.

Mikhailovskii in his article rejected Zhukovskii's coarse and primitive understanding of Marx's theory, while at the same time questioning the applicability of Marx's theory to the Russian situation. Mikhailovskii first called into question the chapter on 'The So-called Primitive Accumulation' in *Capital*, and considered that there Marx was expounding a 'historico-philosophical theory of Universal Progress.' In other words, Mikhailovskii took Marx to be asserting that every country must experience exactly the same process of expropriation of the peasant from the land as had been the case in England. (47) Mikhailovskii then questioned footnote nine of the first German edition of *Capital* where Marx made a mockery of Herzen. Mikhailovskii criticized Marx as follows:

Even judging solely by its overall tone, it can easily be seen what attitude Marx would take toward the efforts of the Russians to find for their country a different path of development from that which Western Europe has followed and is still following - efforts for which there is no need whatsoever to become a Slavophil or to mystically believe in the specially high quality of the Russian nation's spirit; all that is needed is to draw lessons from the history of Europe. (48)

Mikhailovskii pointed out that 'the soul of a Russian disciple of Marx' was torn apart and that 'this collision between moral feeling and historical inevitability should be resolved, of course, in favour of the latter.' 'But the problem,' Mikhailovskii concluded, 'is that one should thoroughly assess whether the sort of historical process that Marx described is truly unavoidable or not.' (49)

Clearly Mikhailovskii directed his criticism against exactly those points which Marx himself had already either corrected or entirely struck out.

After reading this article by Mikhailovskii, Marx started writing the letter as he felt he should not remain silent. Since the letter was to be published in a legal journal in Tsarist Russia under his own signature, Marx took the necessary precautions: he avoided talking about a revolution, chose to refer to Herzen and Chernyshevskii without explicitly mentioning their names, and on the whole talked in the 'language of Aesop'. This is why, at first glance, this letter appears extremely equivocal. Nevertheless, anyone who is familiar with the contents of Mikhailovskii's article and the previous development of Marx's thought can easily understand what Marx is trying to say.

In the first half of the letter, Marx comments on Mikhailovskii's critique of the footnote in the first German edition of *Capital* in which Marx ridiculed Herzen, and points out that Mikhailovskii is

utterly mistaken, since 'in no case can it serve as a key' to Marx's views on the efforts of the Russians to find for their country a path of development different from that of Western Europe. Marx then reminds Mikhailovskii that he calls Chernyshevskii a 'great Russian scholar and critic' in the postscript to the second German edition of *Capital*, which Mikhailovskii had a chance to read; thus Mikhailovskii, argues Marx, 'might just as validly have inferred' that Marx shared Chernyshevskii's Populist views as to conclude, as he actually did in his article, that Marx rejected them. (50) Reserved and brief as these statements are, Marx's reference to the second German edition - the one in which Marx, as we have noted earlier, deleted his words of contempt for Herzen that were present in the first edition, and furthermore newly included words of praise for Chernyshevskii - without doubt reveals his sympathetic attitude toward the Russian Populists. Marx goes on to say that he 'studied the Russian language, and, over a number of years, followed official and other publications that dealt with this question,' and has reached this conclusion: 'If Russia continues along the road which she has followed since 1861, she will forego the finest opportunity that history has ever placed before a nation, and will undergo all the fateful misfortune of capitalist development.' (51) This is the story told in 'the language of Aesop.' Russia since 1861 started to follow the path of capitalist development; should it continue to follow the same path, the peasant commune would be destroyed and with it the possibility of proceeding directly towards socialism based on the rural community. Therefore, dear people of Russia - Marx pleads with all sincerity - don't dare to 'forego the finest opportunity that history has ever placed before a nation', the opportunity that is too precious to be wasted. Throughout the period of the Russo-Turkish War, Marx kept looking forward to a Russian revolution which, he expected, would come on the heels of Russia's defeat in the war, and after the failure of his expectations he felt as if the revolution which he had almost caught in his hands had just slipped through the fingers. This is exactly why he felt compelled here to remind the Russian people that they should not leave things as they were and thus lose for good the great chance of regeneration. This amounts to an appeal to the Russians to start a revolution right away.

In the second half of his letter, Marx quotes from the French edition of *Capital*, explains that the chapter on primitive accumulation only traces the path followed in Western Europe, and thus clarifies for the first time what really was his motivation when he revised this chapter in 1875. Marx further maintains that if this historical sketch were to be applied to Russia, the following two points must be made: (1) 'If Russia attempts to become a capitalist nation, like the nations of Western Europe ... it will not succeed without having first transformed a good part of its peasants into proletarians, and afterwards, (2) once it has crossed the threshold of the capitalist system, it will have to submit to the implacable laws of such a system, like the other Western nations.' (52) It may be possible for us to interpret the second point above as suggesting that if Russia does not cross the threshold of the capitalist system, it need not submit to the implacable law of capitalism. If our interpretation is correct, then the second point above is not much different from Mikhailovskii's 1872 interpretation of the preface to *Capital*. (53) On closer reading of *Capital*, however, Mikhailovskii later began to wonder if he was actually doing justice to Marx's theory. Marx takes advantage of this wavering in Mikhailovskii's interpretation and accuses him of twisting his own theory. 'For him', asserts Marx, 'it is absolutely necessary to change my sketch of the origin of capitalism in Western Europe into an historico-philosophical theory of a Universal Progress, fatally imposed on all peoples, regardless of the historical circumstances in which they find themselves, ending finally in that economic system which assures both the greatest amount of productive power of social labour and the fullest development of man.' (54) Marx says that 'this is to do me both too much honour and too much discredit.' However, the reproach which Marx aims at Mikhailovskii is evidently wide of the mark and irrelevant, for Mikhailovskii's interpretation cannot be regarded as totally mistaken. It is

rather Marx himself who underwent a significant change after he wrote the first German edition of *Capital*.

Before concluding the letter, Marx emphasized that 'events which were strikingly analogous, but which took place in different historical environments, led to entirely dissimilar results.' (55) When Marx made this remark he had in his mind the opportunity open to the Russian village community in the prevailing historical conditions, in particular the existence of the advanced West and the crisis of capitalism there.

This letter which contains Marx's second conclusion on the Russian question was not to be sent. Engels later reasoned that Marx chose not to send it because he was 'afraid that his name would be enough of a threat to the continued existence of the journal' which was going to print the letter. The true reason, I suppose, was rather that Marx, after reading his letter again, saw something wrong with his critique of Mikhailovskii.

IV

The Russian victory in the war with Turkey, after all, reinforced the power of Tsarism inside Russia. In a country whose modern history was literally a series of defeats in wars that resulted either in drastic internal changes or in revolutions, this was the only war that ended in victory. And this very fact seems to have been one of the important factors that precipitated the contest between Tsarism and revolutionary Populism. But let us for the time being go back to the days when the result of the struggle between Tsarism and Populism was still unknown.

Even before the end of the war, the revolutionary Populists were markedly stepping up their efforts. In February 1879 when Engels heard the news of the assassination of Governor Kropotkin of Kharkov, he found a positive meaning in the incident, stating that political assassination was the only means of self-defence available to the Russian intellectuals, and that the movement was 'just about to explode.' (56) His expectations of a Russian revolution were thus brought to life again. They were further enhanced when the Executive Committee of People's Will came into being in the summer of the same year and began its activities. Engels wrote in his new year's letter to Wilhelm Liebknecht dated January 10, 1880: 'I offer you and all of you my congratulations on the New Year and on the Russian Revolution which is most likely to take place during it.' (57)

In contrast, Marx in this period did not put into words any expectations of this sort; but it seems safe to say that he was in the same state of mind as Engels. When, for instance, Leo Hartman visited London in February 1880 as a representative of People's Will, Marx received him very warmly, showed hearty affection for him, and offered to help him as much as possible. (58)

In the months of May through July, Hartman wrote to N. Morozov saying that Marx was reading the 'Program' which Morozov sent him, that he was critical toward the Group Chernyi Peredel (Repartition of Whole Lands) and supported the program of the 'Russian Terrorists', and also that Marx, in spite of his sympathy toward the Terrorists, was unwilling to write for their publications as he found their program something other than that of socialists. (59) We cannot, however, hastily conclude from these observations of Hartman that such was indeed the attitude which Marx finally took towards People's Will.

In November of the same year, Marx received a message from the 'Executive Committee of the Russian Social Revolutionary Party' as well as the program which People's Will prepared for its working-class party members. (60) That Marx read this programme of the worker-members of People's Will very carefully by underlining it here and there is an indication of how highly he evaluated it. As a matter of fact, ever since his encounter with this program, Marx stopped

calling this party the 'Terrorist Party'. On the other hand, his feeling of antipathy toward the members of Repartition of Whole Lands, who were taking refuge in Geneva, grew deeper. Marx spoke of them:

These gentlemen are against all political-revolutionary action. Russia is to make a somersault into the anarchist-communist-atheist millennium! Meanwhile they are preparing for this leap with the most tedious doctrinarism, whose so-called principles have been hawked about the street ever since the late Bakunin. (61)

Meanwhile Marx advanced his Russian studies a step further. In the fall of 1879, he read M.M. Kovalevskii's new book, *Communal Ownership of Land - The Causes, Process and Consequences of its Dissolution, Part I* (Moscow, 1879), and left a very detailed note of it. (62) By comparing Marx's note with the corresponding passage of the original text of the book, we can clearly see that Kovalevskii's resentment towards the land policy of colonizers who accelerated the dissolution of communal ownership of land was emphasised even more strongly by Marx. Take, for instance, the following pair of excerpts:

Kovalevskii: Relying on their testimonies [i.e., testimonies of the government officials in India], the British critics took a calm attitude toward the dissolution of this social form which appeared archaic in their eyes. If some of them on some occasions expressed their regret about its decaying too fast, they did so simply out of considerations of an academic nature ... it occurs to nobody that the British land policy should be regarded first of all as the offender responsible for the dissolution of communal ownership of land. (63)

Marx: British officials in India, as well as critics like Sir Henry Maine who rely on them, described the dissolution of communal ownership of land in Punjab as if it took place as an inevitable consequence of the *economic progress* in spite of the affectionate attitude of the British toward this archaic form. The truth is rather that the British themselves are the *principal* (and active) *offenders* responsible for this dissolution ... (original emphasise). (64)

At about the same time as he read Kovalevskii's book, Marx read an article by N.O. Kostomarov, 'The Revolt of Stenka Razin', and made a very detailed note on it. (65) It may be that he turned to this article hoping to find out about the potential capabilities of the Russian peasants. Important among other Russian books which Marx read around that time is *Collection of Materials for Studies on the Rural Land Commune, Vol. I*, published jointly by the Free Economic Society and the Russian Association of Geography in 1880. Out of this book, Marx made a note only on the article by P.P. Semenov. This note has drawn the attention of scholars in the Soviet Union since Marx, commenting on the social differentiation of peasant households, states: 'The consequence of communal ownership of land is splendid.' (66) What is still more important about Semenov's article is that in passages beyond the point where Marx's note ends, Semenov talks about communal use of land. (67) Semenov notes that in most cases the Russian peasants practice a collective form of production in the meadow lands and distribute the grass mowed there equally among themselves. This description by Semenov left a profound impression on Marx, as can be inferred from his letter to Zasulich.

Marx's theory of Russian capitalism took shape in this period through his discussions with Danielson. More precisely, Marx wrote his well-known letter of April 10, 1879, in reply to Danielson who in his long letter (dated February 17, 1879) pointed out to Marx that the peasants, because of the heavy burden of taxes, were forced to sell the cereals necessary for their own subsistence, and that railways and banks were accelerating these grain transactions,

thereby further impoverishing the peasants. (68) In his letter of response, Marx elaborates on Danielson's description of the destructive functions of railways and generalizes this as a phenomenon characteristic of capitalist development in backward countries everywhere. (69) We might suggest that this shows that Marx was beginning to perceive the structure unique to backward capitalism.

Encouraged by the support he received from Marx, Danielson further developed his idea into an article, 'Outlines of Our Country's Society and Economy after Reform', which was printed in the October 1880 issue of the *Slovo*. Marx's assessment of this article as a whole was quite high, even though he was not satisfied with Danielson's assessment of the abolition of serfdom or with his thesis on the absolute crisis of Russian capitalism. (70) There is thus no denying that Marx owed much to Danielson.

As to the circumstances in which Zasulich wrote her letter to Marx of February 16, 1881, asking for his opinion about the destinies of the rural commune, L. Deich left his own account. According to him, a debate took place around the end of 1880 or the beginning of 1881 in connection with an article by V.P. Vorontsov, printed in an issue of the *Otechestvennye Zapiski*, which asserted that Russia lacked a foundation for capitalist development; and it was decided that Zasulich should write a letter to Marx asking for his opinion on this question. (71) This account of Deich is at variance with what Zasulich herself says in her letter to Marx dated February 16, where she asks for Marx's opinion about the assertion, frequently made by the people who call themselves his special disciples, that the village commune is 'an archaic form', condemned to perdition. (72) If we were to attribute any significance to the recollection of Deich, it is perhaps only by assuming that Deich and his group started a debate not in connection with an article by Vorontsov as he claims, but rather in connection with an article by Danielson which was published immediately before and which caused some stir. My assumption, therefore, is that Deich and his group called into question Danielson's assertion that a 'capitalist current' was already predominant in Russia and was inducing the decay of the communal utilization of land. (73) If we bear in mind that Danielson's position in the 1880s was not very different from Vorontsov, it is not at all surprising if Deich confused Vorontsov with Danielson. Furthermore, Danielson was at the time well known as a disciple of Marx: he quotes Marx so frequently in his own work.

What should also be noticed about Zasulich's letter to Marx is that she not only asked for Marx's opinion but she also demanded an answer that could be made public in the name of her group, Repartition of Whole Lands.

Marx received this letter either on February 18 or 19. February 19, 1881, was the day when Marx, having just finished reading an article by Danielson, was on the point of writing to him about his impression of the article. A few days later on February 22, he wrote a reply to Ferdinand Domela Nieuwenhuis, in Holland, after one and a half months delay.

It was after writing these letters that Marx set about working on his reply to Zasulich. Marx, who supported People's Will, might at first have felt reluctant to comply with the request from Repartition of Whole Lands which he held in contempt. However, he felt obliged to confront the criticism that his disciples were expounding a thesis on the inevitable dissolution of the village commune.

There is no room for doubt that the so-called fourth draft of his letter to Zasulich was written last. However, the three earlier drafts were written not in the order of Riazanov's numbering, but instead in the order: draft two, draft one and draft three. Hinada Shizuma, a Japanese scholar, has made a careful re-examination of the four drafts, (74) and I completely agree with his conclusion. The fact that the concept 'commune agricole' which is absent from draft two begins

to be employed abruptly in the middle of draft one, while in draft three it is used from the outset, obliges us to reason that the three drafts were written in the order mentioned above.

To begin with, in draft two Marx first makes clear that his discussion of primitive accumulation in Capital is not applicable to Russia. He then goes on to discuss matters such as: 'historical environments' which decide the destinies of the village commune; the place which the Russian village commune occupies in the historical chain of 'archaic organizations of society'; the dualism inherent in the structure of the Russian commune; and the alternative paths of its development. He concludes the draft by touching upon the troubles which actually beset the Russian commune. Although Marx brings out all the relevant points in this draft, his thought on the question is still not fully shaped.

Draft one, which was written next, is not written in a flowing style; obviously Marx's pen often halts and limps while writing it. His thought, however, develops far better in this draft than in draft two. Paying attention to the two major characteristics of the agrarian commune, i.e., collectivism and individualism, Marx asserts that this 'dualism' may become the germ of its decomposition, but at the same time it may also permit that aspect of the commune favouring collectivism to overcome that aspect favouring private property. He further maintains that which of the two alternative directions is followed depends entirely on the 'historical environment in which the commune finds itself.' On the basis of this general consideration, Marx also deals with the Russian case. His argument may be roughly summarized as follows:

- (1) In Russia, village communes have been preserved on a vast nation-wide scale.
- (2) Structural characteristics of the Russian commune: (i) the communal ownership of the soil offers the Russian commune a natural basis for collective production and collective appropriation; (ii) the Russian peasants' familiarity with the arte would greatly facilitate the transition from agriculture by individual plot to collective agriculture; and (iii) in the exploitation of the jointly owned meadowlands the Russian peasants already practice a form of communal production.
- (3) 'Historical environments': (i) the transition from agriculture by individual plot to cooperative labour is vital for rescuing Russian agriculture from its crisis, but the material conditions of this transition are already available in the form of technological achievements of the capitalist system; (ii) 'Russian public' - meaning the educated privileged sector of society - which for such a long time has existed at the expense and cost of the village commune owes it the first advances which are necessary for introducing mechanical cultivation; and (iii) the development of the village commune along such a path is exactly what the historical currents of the time were calling for - and the ready proof of this is in the 'fatal crises' that are shaking capitalist production in Europe and America. (75)

There is no mention of a proletarian revolution in Western Europe here. Obviously the whole of Marx's argument is developed, as previously, along lines similar to that of Chernyshevskii. However, there is a marked change in his perception of the way in which the advanced West serves as a precondition for a Russian revolution. Whereas previously he expected that a victorious proletarian revolution in Western Europe and material help from this revolution would constitute a major precondition for a revolution in Russia, he now finds an essential precondition in the technological achievements of capitalism as well as in the crises of capitalist production.

Another important point in draft one of Marx's letter to Zasulich is that he sees as a weakness of the Russian commune its characteristic of being a 'localized micro cosmos.' Marx writes for the first time that all that is necessary to get rid of this weakness is to abolish the volost, a government institution, and to establish in its place 'une assemblee de paysans [an assembly of peasants] which is chosen by the communes themselves, and capable of serving as an

economic and administrative institution for the protection of the interests of those communes. (76) This is the proposal Marx made on the question of what policies should be devised and carried out from above by the revolutionary forces. Placed in the perspective of later events - i.e., from the time of the 1905 Revolution, the Russian peasants united together on a village-commune basis and began to collide with chiefs of *volost'*; and in the 1917 Revolution they abolished the *Volost* chiefs and created their own '*volost'* committees -the proposal of Marx appears to have closely approximated to the social realities. At another point of draft one, he took up this issue once again and wrote at one point that the village commune's features as a 'localized micro cosmos' can be broken only during a 'massive uprising', but later erased this passage. (77) Later in draft three, however, Marx chose to reintroduce this dynamic concept and drop the rather static proposal about *Volost* committees. (78) Marx thus emphasizes the ability of the peasants to change themselves spontaneously.

Marx's analysis of the realities of the Russian village commune and the 'tragedies' which inflict pain upon it (79) depends on Kovalevskii's analysis in its emphasis on the fact that since the time of the emancipation of the peasants, the state, by means of its policies of oppression and exploitation, has aggravated conflicts of interests within the commune, and has rapidly developed the seeds of its decomposition; Marx also relies on Danielson's analysis when he asserts that 'the State has helped in the enrichment of a new capitalist pest which is sucking the already thin blood of the "village commune".'

At the end of the draft, Marx argues, in opposition to the attempts to find a way out of the prevailing crisis through the destruction of the commune and the employment of a new method of exploitation, that 'a Russian revolution is required, if the Russian commune is to be saved.'

Marx writes: 'If the revolution occurs in time, if it concentrates all its forces [...], to insure the free flowering of the rural commune, then the latter will develop itself before long as an element in the regeneration of Russian society, as a point of advantage when compared to the nations enslaved by the capitalist system.' (At the point of the ellipsis [...] in the foregoing quotation, Marx wrote 'and if the intelligent sector of Russian society, the Russian intellect, concentrates all the living forces of this country,' and then crossed it out). (80)

Here, Marx anticipates that even if a Russian revolution were victorious and the regeneration of Russian life took place on the basis of the village commune, these would not immediately be followed by revolutions in other countries in Europe. This seems closely related to a pessimistic view which Marx then held about the possibility of a German revolution at the time of Bismarck's law outlawing socialism. (81)

The viewpoint which Marx presents in draft one is at once the conclusion he arrived at in his Russian studies in the 1870s, as well as the expression of the hope he pinned on People's Will. Needless to say, he does not describe what the process of the social regeneration based on the village commune would be like in actuality. Here, he tries to face the reality with a 'scientific insight' supplemented by a 'Traum' (dream) as he always does. Marx writes in his letter of February 22, 1881, to Nieuwenhuis as follows:

But was there a single Frenchman in the 18th century who sensed even a bit, beforehand and a priori, the way by which the demands of the French bourgeoisie were carried through? A purely theoretical, and thus inevitably fantastic, prophesy of the program of actions for a future revolution would simply turn people's attention away from the present struggle. The fancy that the collapse of the world was imminent let the primitive Christians stand up in the war against the world empire of Rome and gave them confidence in their victory. (82)

Let us now turn to draft three. Hoping to complete his letter of reply by putting his draft one in better order, Marx started this draft with the remark that, while it was impossible for him to deal with the question thoroughly, 'I hope that even this succinct explanation which I am having the honour of offering you would suffice to wipe away all the misunderstandings about my so-called theory'. (83) But Marx abruptly stops writing any further when he is half-way through with his discussion of the 'historical environments'. This is very strange indeed. I am sure that the reason for this abrupt interruption is political. For one reason or another, Marx must have come to think that he, a supporter of People's Will, should not give a different organization, Repartition of Whole Lands, such an important statement on his own and let them publish it in their name. I make this assumption on the basis of the content of draft four, the last draft, of Marx's letter to Zasulich.

Marx starts this draft with an apology for the delay in his reply due to a nervous illness from which he had been suffering for the past ten years, and writes. 'I am sorry, but I cannot send you a succinct explanation, which could be published ... Two months ago I promised a work on the same subject to the St. Petersburg Committee.' (84) If this excuse were really true, Marx might as well have written so from the outset without taking trouble to prepare four drafts. So far no confirmation had been made on the part of People's Will and its allies to the effect that the Executive Committee of this party actually made such a request to Marx. According to Chronological Record of Marx which was published by the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute in the Soviet Union, Morozov who visited Marx at the end of 1880 made such a request to Marx. (85) This, however, is very hard to believe in view of the fact that neither of the two memoirs which Morozov wrote, one before the publication of Chronological Record of Marx and the other after, makes any mention of such a request. (86) I assume that Marx referred to a promise which did not actually exist, for the sake of emphasizing his political position as a supporter of People's Will and refusing to give Zasulich's group, Repartition of Whole Lands, a manuscript for publication.

After this refusal to prepare a statement for publication, Marx says that 'a few lines will suffice' to clear up misunderstandings about his theory, and offers the gist of his statement. The letter that was actually sent is extended to about twice the length of draft four. In this letter, he points out that the analysis of primitive accumulation presented in Capital cannot be applied to Russia; he concludes the letter with the assertion that in order for the commune to serve as the 'point of support of a social regeneration of Russia', 'the poisonous influences that attack it from all sides must be eliminated, and then the normal conditions of a spontaneous development insured.' (87) This conclusion is the most clear-cut elaboration of his thought which was presented in draft one.

V

Marx and Engels were excited over the assassination of the Tsar, Alexander II. They thought that this incident would 'in the end certainly lead to the establishment of the Russian Commune, even if it is by way of fierce struggle.' (88) At the end of March, Engels wrote in his letter to A. Bebel: 'The revolutionary global conditions for the overall crisis which have long been anticipated are ripening.' (89) Marx, for his own part, was trying to put his ideas about the emancipation of serfs in Russia into shape during the same month. In a letter addressed to his daughter Jenny Longuet on April 11, he applauded the attitude which Zheiliabov and Perovskaia showed in the court room: 'Being strong-hearted people through and through, they are without a melodramatic pose, but are simple, sachlich [matter-of-fact] and heroic. Screaming and action are the mutually irreconcilable opposites.' In the same letter, he also commented on the letter

which the Executive Committee of People's Will sent to Alexander III with a remark that it was 'a well refined declaration with moderation.' (90)

Despite Marx's expectations, the assassination of Alexander II neither induced the state power to make a concession nor gave rise to any sort of popular movements except for a wave of anti-Semitic pogroms in the South. By the end of 1881, Marx was completely exhausted mentally and physically; his beloved wife passed away on December 2 and he was himself sick in bed. Towards the end of the year he visited Ventnor for a change of air. While staying there he did not make any response to what Engels wrote to him about the political situation in Russia, as if he were not interested in such matters any more.

Upon his return to London on January 16, 1882, Marx found there waiting for him a letter from P. Lavrov asking him and Engels to write a new preface to the Russian edition of the Communist Manifesto which was soon to be published. (91) Marx decided that this request must be complied with.

The manuscript of the preface marked 'London, 21 February 1881' was drafted entirely by Engels, with Marx doing nothing other than making one very minor correction and affixing his signature. (92) In view of the fact that the manuscript we have today has a passage towards the end which was written once, crossed out, and then rewritten, it is impossible to regard it as a clean copy which Engels transcribed from yet another manuscript. All these factors logically lead us to infer that Marx, who was in low spirits at the time, asked Engels to make a draft, and put his signature to it. That Marx was not entirely satisfied with the manuscript can be guessed from the letter which he sent to Lavrov along with the manuscript: 'If this piece, which is meant for translation into Russian, were to be published as it is in German, it still needs finishing touches to its style.' (93)

This famous preface to the Russian edition of the Communist Manifesto has this to say on the destinies of the Russian community:

The only possible answer to this question at the present time is the following: if the Russian revolution becomes the signal for a proletarian revolution in the West, so that the two can supplement each other, then present Russian communal land ownership can serve as a point of departure for a communist development. (94)

The prospect offered here is different from that in Marx's letter to Zasulich and its drafts in that it postulates as a precondition for a Russian regeneration the occurrence of a proletarian revolution in the West. Engels continued to believe firmly that a Russian revolution, once started, would be sure to be followed by a German revolution. One month later, Engels wrote in his letter of February 22 to Bernstein:

We have in Germany a situation which is certain to move toward a revolution at an increasing speed and push our Party to the forefront within a short period of time ... One thing we want is an immediate impact from without. It is the situation in Russia that will provide this for us. (95)

Notes

1. Wada, Haruki, *Marukusu to Kakamei Roshia* (Marx, Engels and Revolutionary Russia), Tokyo 1975.
2. Karl Marx – Friedrich Engels, *Werke* (hereafter abbreviated M.E.W.), Berlin 1953-, vol. 36, p.121.
3. K. Marks, F. Engels, i revoliutsionnaia Rossiia, Moscow 1967, p.504.
4. K. Marks, F. Engels, i revoliutsionnaia Rossiia, pp.521-522.
5. 'Pis'mo Karla Marks'a', *Vestnik Narodnoi Voli*, no. 5, Geneva 1886, p.215.
6. G. Uspenskii, 'Gor'kii uprek', *Sobranie sochinenii*, vol. 9, Moscow 1957, p.172.
7. V.I. Lenin, *Potnoe sobranie sochinenii*, vol. 1, pp.273-4; G.B. Plekhanov, *Sochineniia*, vol. vii, pp.263-264.
8. Arkhiv K. Marks'a i F. Engel'sa, vol. 1, Moscow-Leningrad, 1924, pp.265-266; Marx Engels Archiv, vol. 1, Frankfurt-am-Main, 1926, pp.309-310.
9. Nikolajewski, 'Marx und das russische Problem', *Die Gesellschaft*, vol. 1, no. 4, July, 1924, pp.362, 364.
10. Arkhiv K. Marks'a i F. Engel'sa, vol. 1, 1924, pp.266-267.
11. V. Zenzinov, 'Propavshaia grarnota', *Sovremennye zapiski*, book xxiv, Paris 1925, pp.399, 401.
12. V. Chernov, *Konstruktivnyi sotsializm*, Prague 1925, p.128.
13. N. Sukhanov, 'Obschina v sovetskem agrarnom zakonodatel 'stve', No agrarnom fronte, no. 11-12, 1926, p.110.
14. A. Suchkov, 'Kak ne nado rassmatrivat' vopros O formakh zemlrpol zovasnii', *Bol'shevik*, no. 2, 1928.
15. M. Potash, 'Marks i Engel's O narodnicheskem sotsializme v Rossii', *Proletarskaia revoliutsiia*, no. 12, 1929, p.A1.
16. A. Ryndich, 'Marks, Engel's i Lenin O narodnichestve', *Proletarskaia revoliutsiia*, no. 5, 1930, pp.177, 178.
17. M. Potash, 'Kak ne sleduet pisat' O revoliutsionnom narodnichestve i narodovol 'chestve', *Proletarskaia revoliutsiia*, no. 5, 1930, p.208.
18. Karl Marx, *Das Kapital, Kritik der politischen Oekonomie*, vol. 1, Hamburg 1867, p.763. (Haxthausen, a Prussian official, came out of a German romantic environment and his ideas on agrarian relations derived from the romantic idea of the Volk. His three volume work on Russia originally appeared in Hanover in 1847. His discovery of the collectivist character of the Russian village was enthusiastically taken up by Slavophils and early populists like Herzen).
19. M.E.W., vol. 32, p.197.
20. Marx, Capital, vol. 1, p. ix.
21. M.E.W., vol. 32, pA37.
22. M.E.W., vol. 32, p.659.
23. B. Nikolaevskii, 'Russkie knigi v bibliotekakh K. Marks'a i F. Engel'sa', *Arkhiv K. Marks'a i F. Engel'sa*, bk. 4, Moscow-Leningrad 1929, p.380.

24. In various passages of this book, Marx writes such criticisms as 'not true', 'stupid', 'error' (NiloJaevskii, *Arkhiv*, bk. 4, pp.385-389). However, this, I think, is not necessarily inconsistent with Lopatin's account that Marx thought very highly of this book. See *Russkie sovremenniki O K. Markse i F. Engel'se*, Moscow 1969, pA6.

25. K. Marks, F. Engels, *i revoliutsionnaia Rossiiia*, Moscow, 1967, pp.186-187.

26. M.E.W., vol. 33, p.183.

27. K. Marx, *Das Kapital, Kritik der politischen Oekonomie*, vol. 1, 2nd improved ed., Hamburg 1872, p.817.

28. N.G. Chernyshevskii, *Stat'i ob obschinnom vladenii zemlei*, Geneva 1872, ppA1-41; N.G. Chernyshevskii, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, vol. iv, p.341.

29. Chernyshevskii, *Stat'i*, pp.182-183; Chernyshevskii, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, vol. v, pp. 388-389.

30. Chernyshevskii, *Stat'i*, p.181; Chernyshevskii, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, vol. v, p.387.

31. Nikolaevskii, 'Russkie knigi', pp.390-391.

32. M.E.W., vol. 33, p.577.

33. Nikolaevskii, 'Russkie knigi', pp.403-404.

34. K. Marx, *Das Kapital*, vol. 1, Hamburg, 1867, p.701; *Das Kapital*, 2nd ed., Hamburg, 1872, pp744-745.

35. K. Marx, *Le Capital*, ed. Lachatre, Paris, p.315.

36. M.E. W., vol. 18, pp.540-541.

37. M.E. W., vol. 34, p.8.

38. R. Koniushaia, *Karl Marks i revoliutsionnaia Rossiiia*, Moscow, 1975, p.331.

39. M.E.W., vol. 18, p.541.

40. P.N. Tkachev, *Izbrannye sochineniiia na sotsial 'nopoliticheskie temy*, vol. 3, Moscow, 1933, pp.69-70. (For reasons of space, we have been forced to summarise Wada's interpretation of Engels' answer to Tkachev. For the full argument in this section, see *Annals of the Institution of Social Science*, no. 18, Tokyo University, 1977.

41. M.E.W., vol. 18, p.565.

42. The note is found in *Arkhiv Marks i Engel'sa*, vol. xi, Moscow, 1948, pp.21-118; vol. xii, Moscow, 1952, pp.140-160. See also M.E.W., vol. 18, p.642.

43. Nikolaevskii, 'Russkie knigi', pp.409-412.

44. M.E.W., vol. 34, p.296.

45. M.E.W., vol. 34, p.317.

46. M.E.W., vol. 34, p.359.

47. N.K. Mikhailovskii, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, vol. iv, St Petersburg, 1909, pp.167-168.

48. Mikhailovskii, *Pol.sobr.soch.*, vol. iv, p.171.

49. Mikhailovskii, *Pol.sobr.soch.*, vol. iv, pp.172-173.

50. M.E.W., vol. 19, p.108.

51. M.E.W., vol. 19, p.108.

52. M.E.W., vol. 19, p.111.

53. Marx wrote in the preface to the first German edition of *Capital*, volume 1, as follows: 'Auch wenn eine Gesellschaft dem Naturgesetz ihrer Bewegung auf die Spur gekommen ist ... kann sie naturgemasse Entwicklungsphasen weder iiberspringen noch wegdekretieren'. (Marx, *Das Kapital*, vol 1, Hamburg 1867, p.x). In English this passage means: 'and even if a society has got on the track of discovering the natural laws of its movement ... it can neither clear by bold leaps nor remove by legal enactment the successive phases of its normal development'. When Danielson translated this passage into Russian, he skipped the word 'auch' (even) with the result that his translation reads: 'Kogda kakoenibud' obshchestvo napalo na sled estestvennogo zakona svoego razvitiia ...' (Marks, *Kapital*, vol. 1, St Petersburg 1872, p.xii). Here, the phrase 'napalo na sled' means 'has discovered the track'; however, with the omission of the word 'auch', the meaning of the whole passage became unclear. In his review of this Russian edition of *Capital* volume I, therefore, Mikhailovskii quoted the passage by correcting 'napalo' into 'popalo', i.e. he interpreted the sentence in the following sense: 'when a society has got on the track of the natural laws of its movement, it can clear by bold leaps ...' In other words, he interpreted Marx as insisting here that 'if a society has not entered the track of the natural laws of its movement, it can clear by bold leaps ... the successive phases of its normal development' (Mikhailovskii, *Pol.sobr.soch.*, vol. x, St Petersburg 1913, p.10).

54. M.E.W., vol. 19, p.111.

55. M.E.W., vol. 19, p.112.

56. M.E.W., vol. 19, p.149.

57. M.E.W., vol. 34, p.437.

58. The intimate relations between Marx and Hartman surprised socialists in the West. Henry Hyndman, *The Record of an Adventurous Life*, London, 1911, p.280; E. Bernstein, 'Karl Marks i russkie revol'iutsionery', *Minuvshie gody*, November 1908, p.21.

59. *Russkie sovremenniki* O K. Markse i F. Engel'se, p.180; E.G. Volk, 'Karl Marks, Fridrikh Engel's i "Narodnaia Volia"', *Obshchestvennoe dvizhenie v poreformennoi Rossii*, Moscow, 1965, p.51.

60. Both are collected in *Revoliutsionnoe narodnichestvo semidesiatykh godov xix veka*, vol. ii, Moscow-Leningrad, 1965, pp.184-185, 228-230.

61. M.E.W., vol. 34, p.477.

62. The note is collected in *Sovetskoe vostokovedenie*, no. 3, 1958, pp.3-13; no. 4, pp.3-22; no. 5, pp.3-28. *Problemy vostokovedeniia*, no. 1, 1959, pp.1-17. *Narody Azii i Afriki*, no. 2, 1962, pp.3-17.

63. M. Kovalevskii, *Obshchinoe zemlevladenie, prichiny, khod i posledstviia ego razlozheniiia*, pt. 1, Moscow 1879, p.184.

64. *Sovetskoe vostokovedenie*, no. 5, 1908, p.20.

65. The note is collected in 'K. Marks, Sten'ka Razin', *Molodaia gvardiia*, bk. 1, 1926, pp.104-123.

66. *Arkhiv Marksа i Engei'sa*, vol. xii, p.128.

67. *Sbornik materialov dlia izucheniiia sel'skoi pozemel'noi obshchiny*, vol. 1, St Petersburg 1880, pp.123-124.

68. K. Marks, F. Engel's, *i revoliutsionnaia Rossiiia*, pp.357-373.

69. M.E.W., vol. 34, pp.372-374.

70. M.E.W., vol. 34, pp.35, 155.

71. *Gruppa 'Osvobozhdenie truda'*, no. 2, p.218.

72. *Marx-Engels Archiv*, vol. 1, pp.316-317.

73. The article written in 1880 is included in the first part of his book published in 1893. Nikolaiion, *Ocherki nashego poreformennogo obshchestvennogo khoziaistva*, St Petersburg 1893, p.71.

74. Hinada Shizuma, 'On the Meaning in our Time of the Drafts of Marx's Letter to Vera Zasulich (1881)', *Sura vu Kenkyu* (Slavic Studies), no. 20, 1975.

75. *Marx-Engels Archiv*, vol. 1, pp.323-326.

76. *Marx-Engels Archiv*, vol. 1, p.324.

77. *Marx-Engels Archiv*, vol. 1, p.325.

78. *Marx-Engels Archiv*, vol. 1, p.339.

79. *Marx-Engels Archiv*; vol. 1, pp.326-327.

80. *Marx-Engels Archiv*; vol. 1, p.329.

81. In 1880, Marx explained his view of the situations in European countries to Swinton, an American journalist. He talked with much 'hope' about the 'dynamic fermentation of the intellect' taking place in Russia, but with regard to Germany he simply commented 'philosophically' about the 'development of the mental aspects'. R. Koniushaia, *Karl Marks i revoliutsionnaia Rossiiia*, Moscow 1975, p.379.

82. M.E.W., vol. 35, pp.160-161.

83. *Marx-Engels Archiv*, vol. 1, p.334.

84. *Marx-Engels Archiv*, vol. 1, p.340.

85. Kart Marx, *Chronik seines Lebens in Einzelndaten*, Moscow 1934, p.381.

86. N. Morozov, 'Karl Marks i "Narodnaia Volia" v nachale bokh godov', *Katorga i ssylka*, no. 3, 1933, pp.145-147; N. Morozov, 'U Karla Marksia', *Izvestiia*, 7 November 1935, p.5.

87. *Marx-Engels Archiv*, vol. 1, p.342.

88. M.E.W., vol. 19, p.244.

89. M.E.W., vol.35, p.175.

90. M.E.W., vol. 35, p.179.

91. K. Marks, F. Engel's, *i revoliutsionnaia Rossiiia*, pp.457-458.

92. The photocopy of this manuscript is collected in 'K. Marx, letiui "Kornrnunisticheskogo Manifesta"', *Byloe*, no. 22, 1927, pp.314-315.

93. M.E.W., vol. 35, p.262.

94. M.E.W., vol. 19, p.296.

95. M.E.W., vol. 35, p.283.